arXiv:0803.3730v2 [math.AG] 19 Oct 2008

EFFECTIVE MODELS AND EXTENSION OF TORSORS OVER A DISCRETE VALUATION RING OF UNEQUAL CHARACTERISTIC

DAJANO TOSSICI

Abstract. Let R be a discrete valuation ring of unequal characteristic with fraction field K which contains a primitive p^2-th root of unity. Let X be a faithfully flat R-scheme and G be a finite abstract group. Let us consider a G-torsor $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ and let Y be the normalization of X_K in Y. If $G = \mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$, $n \leq 2$, under some hypothesis on X, we attach some invariants to $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$. If $p > 2$, we determine, through these invariants, when $Y \longrightarrow X$ has a structure of torsor which extends that of $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$. Moreover, we explicitly calculate the effective model (recently defined by Romagny) of the action of G on Y.

Contents

Introduction 1
Acknowledgments. 3
1. Effective models 4
2. Models of $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})_K$ and $(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})_K$ 7
2.1. Some group schemes of order p^n and models of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ 7
2.2. Models of $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$ 9
2.3. Torsors under $G_{\lambda,n}$ and $\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F(S),j)}$ 13
3. A filtration of $H^1(X,\mu_{p^n})$ 15
4. Weak extension of torsors under commutative group schemes 16
4.1. Preliminary results 16
4.2. Weak extension 19
5. Strong extension of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$-torsors 23
6. Strong extension of $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsors 24
6.1. Setup and degeneration types 24
6.2. The main theorem 28
7. Realization of degeneration types 35
References 39

Introduction

Notation and conventions. Throughout the paper, except in §1, we denote by R a discrete valuation ring (d.v.r. in the sequel) of unequal characteristic, i.e. a discrete valuation ring with fraction field K of characteristic zero and residue field k of characteristic $p > 0$. Moreover, we write $S = \mathrm{Spec}(R)$. If, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a distinguished primitive p^n-th root of unity ζ_n in R, we write $\lambda_{(n)} := \zeta_n - 1$. Moreover, for any $i \leq n$, we suppose $\zeta_{i-1} = \zeta_i^p$. We remark that $v(\lambda_{(n-1)}) = pv(\lambda_{(n)})$ and $v(p) = p^{n-1}(p-1)v(\lambda_{(n)})$. We will denote by $\pi \in R$ one of its uniformizers. Moreover if G is an affine R-group scheme we will denote by $R[G]$ the associated Hopf algebra. All the schemes will be assumed noœtherian, however, sometimes we will explicitly stress this fact. If not otherwise specified, the cohomology is calculated in the fppf topology.

Key words and phrases. finite group schemes, torsors, unequal characteristic.

Let G be a finite group. It is known that there is a nice smooth proper stack classifying admissible G-Galois covers of stable curves over K, with fixed ramification invariants. While the problem of understanding its reduction $\mod \pi$ seems quite far from being solved. The first phenomenon which may occur is the following. Let us consider a generically smooth stable marked curve $Y \to S$ with an action of a finite group G with order divisible by p. Denote $X = Y/G$ and let us assume that G acts freely on Y outside the set of marked points. It could happen that the reduced action of G on the special fibre is not faithful. An attempt to solve this kind of problems is the introduction of the notions of effective models (by Romagny [19]) and Raynaud's group schemes (by Abramovich [3]). They are very similar notions. In this paper we will utilize the first one. More precisely we will investigate in detail on effective models of actions of cyclic groups of order p and p^2.

Another motivation for this work, related in some sense to the first one, is the construction of a Hurwitz space for automorphisms of order p^2 of the formal disc $\mathrm{Spec}(R[[T]])$. We recall that for automorphisms of order p it has been done by Henrio ([12]). One of the main tools that Henrio used is the strong extension (see later in the introduction for the definition) of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$-torsors over the boundary of the formal disc $\mathrm{Spec}(R[[T]]\{T^{-1}\})$ where $R[[T]]\{T^{-1}\} := \{\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} a_iT^i \text{ such that } \lim_{i\to-\infty} a_i = 0\}$. We will speak again about it at the end of the introduction.

We now introduce more precisely the problem. Let G be an abstract finite group, X a faithfully flat scheme over R and $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ a G_K-torsor. We remark that, since K is of characteristic 0, any finite group scheme is étale; so, up to an extension of R, any group scheme over K is an abstract group. We call Y the normalization of X in Y_K. A natural question is the following.

COARSE QUESTION: *is it possible to find a model $\mathcal{G}$ of G_K over R together with an action on Y such that $Y \longrightarrow X$ is a $\mathcal{G}$-torsor and the action of G coincides with that of G_K on the generic fiber?*

If it happens we say that $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ can be *strongly extended*. We observe that the G-action on Y_K can be extended to a G-action $\mu : G \times_R Y \longrightarrow Y$. The action could be not faithful on the special fiber. The effective model, as we just said, solve this problem. An effective model for μ is a flat R-group scheme, dominated by G, with an action on Y compatible with μ, such that the action is also faithful. We will recall its precise definition in §1. When it exists, it is unique. This implies that if there exists $\mathcal{G}$ as above, then $\mathcal{G}$ must be the effective model of μ. So the above question can be reformulated in the following way.

QUESTION: *Which is the effective model $\mathcal{G}$ (if it exists) for the G-action? When is $Y \longrightarrow X$ a $\mathcal{G}$-torsor?*

Let us suppose that $(|G|, p) = 1$. It is classical that, if X is regular with geometrically integral fibers then, up to an extension of R, any connected G-torsor can be strongly extended. This follows from the Theorem of Purity of Zariski-Nagata ([2, X 3.1]) and from the Lemma of Abhyankar ([2, X 3.6]). See 4.2.12 for the same result when X is not necessarily regular and G is abelian.

Let us now consider the case when $p||G|$. The first case is $G = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$. For this group the effective models of its actions have been calculated in some cases. For details see the papers of Raynaud ([16, 1.2.1]), when $X = \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ and R complete, of Green-Matignon ([9, III 1.1]), when X is the p-adic closed disc, of Henrio ([12, 1.6]), for factorial affine R-curves complete with respect to the π-adic topology, and of Saïdi ([20, 2.4]) for formal smooth curves of finite type. We remark that the above results are true under the further assumption that X_k and Y_k are integral. In all the above cases, the effective model induces a structure of torsor, i.e. the $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$-torsor $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ is strongly extendible. In the affine case, we will extend these results (with weaker hypothesis on X) also in higher dimensions and, moreover, we will treat the case $G = \mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$.

The paper is organized as follows. In the first section we recall the definition of effective models and the principal results about them. These results are taken from [19]. In the second one, we recall results (taken from [27]) about the classification of finite and flat group schemes over R which are isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})_K$ ($n \leq 2$) on the generic fiber. We will call these group schemes models of $(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})_K$ ($n \leq 2$). These models are the candidates to be effective models for actions of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$. In the third section, we construct a filtration of $H^1(X, \mu_{p^n})$ which will be useful to find the effective model of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$-actions and $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-actions. In §4 we give a weak answer to the coarse question for commutative group schemes. For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and any scheme Z, we define ${}_mPic(Z) := \ker(Pic(Z) \xrightarrow{m} Pic(Z))$. The precise statement is the following.

Corollary. *4.2.8 Let G be an abelian group of order m and let us suppose that R contains a primitive m-th root of unity. Let X be a normal faithfully flat scheme over R with integral fibers and ${}_mPic(X) = {}_mPic(X_K)$. Let us consider a connected G-torsor $f_K : Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ and let Y be the normalization of X in Y_K. Moreover, we assume that Y_k is reduced. Then there exists a (commutative) R-group-scheme G' and a G'-torsor $Y' \longrightarrow X$ over R which extends f_K.*

The point is that we do not require Y' to coincide with Y, i.e. we do not require Y' to be normal. In such a case we speak about *weak extension*. Clearly, strong extension implies weak extension.

In §5 we study the strong extension of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$-torsors. Let us suppose that R contains a primitive p-th root of unity. We now suppose that $X = \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ is a normal faithfully flat R-scheme with integral fibers such that $\pi \in \mathcal{R}_A$, where $\mathcal{R}_A$ is the Jacobson radical of A, and ${}_pPic(X_K) = 0$ (e.g. A a local regular faithfully flat R-algebra with integral fibers). We will prove in 5.0.1 that any connected $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$-torsor $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ is strongly extendible under the assumption that the special fiber of the normalization Y of X in Y_K is reduced.

In the sixth section, we consider the case $G = \mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$. We will assume that R contains a primitive p^2-th root of unity. Let $X := \mathrm{Spec}\, A$ be a normal essentially semireflexive scheme over R (see §1) with integral fibers such that $\pi \in \mathcal{R}_A$. We moreover assume ${}_{p^2}Pic(X_K) = 0$. Let $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ a connected $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsor, Y be the normalization of X_K in Y, and assume that Y_k integral. We will attach to any such $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsor an element of $\mathbb{N}^4$. Our main result is that, for $p > 2$, this element determines its effective model $\mathcal{G}$, which we explicitly describe (see 6.2.1). Moreover, we will give a criterion to see if Y is a $\mathcal{G}$-torsor (see 6.2.7). Finally, we will give an example of $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsor over X_K satisfying the above hypothesis but non-strongly extendible.

The last section is devoted to study elements of $\mathbb{N}^4$ which arise from a $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsor over X_K as above. The main result of this section is the theorem 7.0.8 about the classification of 4-uples of natural integers which are associated to strongly extendible $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsors over X_K.

We recall that the case R of positive characteristic has been studied by Saïdi in [22]. He proved a result of strong extension of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$-torsors for formal normal schemes of finite type of any dimension ([22, 2.2.1]) and moreover he studied the case of $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsors. His approach is slightly different: he is not interested in effective models but only in explicit equations of the induced cover on the special fiber. Moreover, he gave an example of non strongly extendible $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsors in [21]. Another such example has been given by Romagny ([19, 2.2.2]). We remark that in equal characteristic there is no criterion to determine if a $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsor is strongly extendible.

To study extensions of $\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$-torsors, with $n \geq 3$, it is necessary to have an explicit classification of models of $(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})_K$ as done in [27] for models of $(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})_K$. The strategy used in [27] could be used, in principle, also for models of $(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})_K$. However, this could lead to very complicated calculations.

We finally remark about the construction of a Hurwitz space for automorphisms of order p^2 mentioned earlier, that, since the strong extension does not work for $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsors, it seems reasonable to restrict to automorphisms of order p^2 which induce, on the boundary of the formal disc, strongly extendible covers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

This paper constitutes part of my PhD thesis. It is a pleasure to thank my advisor Professor Carlo Gasbarri for guidance and constant encouragement. Part of this work was done during my visit to Professor Michel Matignon in 2005 at the Department of Mathematics of the University of Bordeaux 1. I am indebted to him for the useful conversations and for his great interest in my work. I am deeply grateful to Matthieu Romagny for having pointed out me his work [19] and, above all, for his very careful reading of this paper and for his several comments, suggestions and remarks which helped me to improve an earlier version of the paper. Finally I thank Marco Antei for useful discussions.

1. Effective models

Here we recall some definitions and results about effective models which will play a key role in our results about extensions of $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsors. For more details see [19], from which most of the material of this paragraph has been taken. In this section R, is a d.v.r. not necessarily of unequal characteristic. We firstly recall the definition of model of a group scheme.

Definition 1.0.1. Let H_K be a group scheme over K. Any flat R-group scheme G such that $G_K \simeq H_K$ is called a *model* of H_K. If H_K is finite over K we also require that G is finite over R.

In [15, § 2], the relation of *domination* between models of a group scheme has been introduced.

Definition 1.0.2. Let G_1 and G_2 be finite flat group schemes over R with an isomorphism $u_K\colon G_{1,K} \longrightarrow G_{2,K}$. We say that G_1 *dominates* G_2 if we are given an R-morphism $u\colon G_1 \longrightarrow G_2$ which restricts to u_K on the generic fibre. The map u is also called a *model map*. If moreover we are given two actions $\mu_i : G_i \times_R Y \longrightarrow Y$, for $i = 1, 2$, we say that G_1 dominates G_2 *compatibly* (with the actions) if $\mu_1 = \mu_2 \circ (u \times \mathrm{id})$.

We now recall the definition of a faithful action.

Definition 1.0.3. Let G be a group scheme which acts on a scheme Y over a scheme T. This action is *faithful* if the induced morphism of sheaves of groups, in the fppf topology of T,

$$G \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}ut_T(Y)$$

is injective.

We recall here the definition of effective model given by Romagny.

Definition 1.0.4. Let G be a finite flat group scheme over R. Let Y be a faithfully flat scheme over R. Let $\mu\colon G \times_R Y \longrightarrow Y$ be an action, faithful on the generic fibre. An *effective model* for μ is a finite flat R-group scheme $\mathcal{G}$ acting on Y, dominated by G compatibly, such that $\mathcal{G}$ acts faithfully on Y.

Example 1.0.5. Let X be a faithfully flat scheme over R and $\mathcal{G}$ a finite and flat group scheme over R. Let $Y \longrightarrow X$ be a $\mathcal{G}$-torsor over R. Then $\mathcal{G}$ is already an effective model. Indeed let us suppose that $\mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}ut_R(Y)$ is not injective. Then there exists a faithfully flat morphism $U \longrightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ and $g \in \mathcal{G}(U) \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$Y \times_R U \xrightarrow{g\times id} \mathcal{G} \times_R Y \times_R U \xrightarrow{\mu\times\mathrm{id}} Y \times_R Y \times_R U$$

is equal to $\Delta \times \mathrm{id} : Y \times_R U \longrightarrow Y \times_R Y \times_R U$ where $\Delta : Y \longrightarrow Y \times_R Y$ is the diagonal morphism. By the definition of $\mathcal{G}$-torsor $\mathcal{G} \times_R Y \times_R U \xrightarrow{\mu\times\mathrm{id}} Y \times_R Y \times_R U$ is an isomorphism. Then

$$Y \times_R U \xrightarrow{g\times id} \mathcal{G} \times_R Y \times_R U \xrightarrow{\mu\times\mathrm{id}} Y \times_R Y \times_R U \xrightarrow{(\mu\times\mathrm{id})^{-1}} \mathcal{G} \times_R Y \times_R U$$

is the zero section, against assumptions.

We report here some results about effective models.

Proposition 1.0.6. *An effective model is unique up to unique isomorphism, if it exists.*

Proof. [19, 1.1.2]. □

The following crucial remark is the reason for our interest in effective models.

Remark 1.0.7. Let G be a finite and flat group scheme over R and Y a faithfully flat scheme over R. Let $\mu\colon G\times_R Y\longrightarrow Y$ be an action. Moreover we suppose that $Y_K\longrightarrow Y_K/G_K$ is a G_K-torsor. Then by 1.0.6 we have that the effective model $\mathcal{G}$ whose action extends that of G_K is unique if it exists. By 1.0.5 this means that if there exists a model G' of G_K, compatible with the action, such that Y is a G'-torsor, then G' is the effective model for μ.

We recall that an action $\mu : G\times_R Y\longrightarrow Y$ is admissible if Y can be covered by G-stable open affine subschemes.

Proposition 1.0.8. *Let G be a finite flat group scheme over R. Let Y be a faithfully flat scheme over R and $\mu : G\times_R Y\longrightarrow Y$ an admissible action, faithful on the generic fiber. Assume there exists an effective model $\mathcal{G}$. Then*

(i) *If H is a finite flat subgroup of G, the restriction of the action to H has an effective model $\mathcal{H}$ which is the schematic image of H in $\mathcal{G}$. If H is normal in G, then $\mathcal{H}$ is also normal in $\mathcal{G}$.*
(ii) *The identity of Y induces an isomorphism $Y/G\simeq Y/\mathcal{G}$.*
(iii) *Assume that there exists an open subset $U\subseteq Y$ which is schematically dense in any fiber of $Y\longrightarrow \operatorname{Spec}(R)$ such that $\mathcal{G}$ acts freely on U. Then for any closed normal subgroup $H\lhd G$ the effective model of G/H acting on X/H is $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. [19, 1.1.3]. □

Theorem 1.0.9. *Let G be a finite flat group scheme over R. Let Y be a faithfully flat scheme of finite type over R and let $\mu\colon G\times Y\longrightarrow Y$ be an action. We assume that Y is covered by G-stable open affines U_i with function ring separated for the π-adic topology, such that G acts faithfully on the generic fibre $U_{i,K}$. Then, if Y has reduced special fibre, there exists an effective model for the action of G.*

Proof. [19, 1.2.3]. □

We remark that the condition about the separatedness of the function rings of U_i is assured if, for instance, we assume Y noœtherian and integral. This follows from the Theorem of Krull ([13, 1.3.13]).

If we add some hypothesis on Y, then we have a useful criterion to see if a group scheme which acts on Y is the effective model for the action.

Recall that a module M over a ring A is called *semireflexive* if the canonical map from M to its bidual is injective. Equivalently, M is a submodule of some product module A^I. Indeed, consider the set $I=\operatorname{Hom}_A(M,A)$ and the morphism $a : M\to A^I$ mapping x to the collection of values $(f(x))_{f\in I}$ for all linear forms f. By definition, if M is semireflexive then for each nonzero $x\in M$ there exists a linear form such that $f(x)\neq 0$, so a is injective. The converse is easy.

Remark 1.0.10. A semireflexive module over R is faithfully flat and separated with respect to the π-adic topology. Indeed, since $M\subseteq R^I$ for some set I, then M is torsion free, hence flat over R. Moreover let $x\in\cap\pi^m M$. Then for any linear form f we have $f(x)\in\cap\pi^m R=0$. Since M is semireflexive over R, this implies $\cap\pi^m M=0$. So M is separated with respect to the π-adic topology. But, over a d.v.r, being flat and separated with respect to the π-adic topology implies faithfully flat. Indeed, since $\cap\pi^m M=0$ implies $M\neq\pi M$, then M is faithfully flat (see [13, 1.2.17]). We do not know if the converse is true too, i.e. if any (faithfully) flat R-module separated with respect to the π-adic topology is semireflexive over R.

Remark 1.0.11. If M is semireflexive over R and $M'\subseteq M$ is an inclusion of R-modules then M' is semireflexive over R. It easily follows by definition.

Example 1.0.12. Any free R-module is semireflexive over R, e.g. any reduced faithfully flat R-algebra of finite type with geometrically irreducible fibers (see [10, 3.3.4,3.3.5]). Other examples, not free, are $R[[T_1,\dots,T_n]]$ or

$$R[[T_1,\dots,T_n]]\{T_1^{-1},\dots,T_n^{-1}\} := \{\sum_{(i_1,\dots,i_n)\in\mathbb{Z}^n} a_{i_1\dots i_n}T^{i_1}\dots T^{i_n} \text{ such that } \lim_{i_1+\dots+i_n\to-\infty} a_{i_1\dots i_n}=0\}.$$

Finally, if R is complete, $X \longrightarrow R$ a smooth surjective morphism of finite type of dimension n and $x\in X$ a closed point in the special fiber with residue field k then $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is semireflexive over R. This follows from the previous remark since $O_{X,x}\subseteq \widehat{O}_{X,x}\simeq R[[T_1,\dots,T_n]]$.

The following lemma will be useful in §6.

Lemma 1.0.13. *Let A be an R-algebra which is semireflexive as an R-module and let B be a flat R-algebra. If there exists a finite R-morphism of modules*

$$A\longrightarrow B,$$

such that B_K is semireflexive as an A_K-module, then B is semireflexive as an R-module.

Remark 1.0.14. In particular any finite and flat R-algebra is semireflexive as an R-module.

Proof. Let us consider B_K. It is a vector space over K, so in particular it is semireflexive over K. Since A and B are flat over R, the natural maps $A\longrightarrow A_K$ and $B\longrightarrow B_K$ are injective. We now prove that B is semireflexive over A. Let $b\in B$ and let us take an A_K-linear form $f: B_K\longrightarrow A_K$ such that $f(b)\neq 0$. It exists since B_K is semireflexive over A_K. Let $b_1,\dots,b_m$ generators of B as an A-module and let $n\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $\pi^n f(b_i)\in A$ for $i=1,\dots,m$. Then we have $\pi^n f(B)\subseteq A$. Moreover, $\pi^n f(b)\neq 0$, since A is flat over R by 1.0.10. So $\pi^n f: B\longrightarrow A$ is a linear form with $\pi^n f(b)\neq 0$. Then B is semireflexive as an A-module. But A is semireflexive over R. Therefore, B is semireflexive over R. Indeed for any $b\in B$ let us take an A-linear form $g: B\longrightarrow A$ with $g(b)\neq 0$. Moreover, let us consider an R-linear form $h: A\longrightarrow R$ such that $h(g(b))\neq 0$. Then $h\circ g: B\longrightarrow R$ is an R-linear form with $h\circ g(b)\neq 0$. Hence, B is semireflexive over R. ☐

Definition 1.0.15. We will say that a morphism of schemes $f: X\to T$ is *essentially semireflexive* if there exists a cover of T by open affine subschemes T_i, an affine faithfully flat T_i-scheme T_i' for all i, and a cover of $X_i'=X\times_T T_i'$ by open affine subschemes X_{ij}', such that the function ring of X_{ij}' is semireflexive as a module over the function ring of T_i'.

This is a generalization of the definition of an essentially free morphism given in [1]. The proofs of the following two lemmas have been suggested to us by Romagny.

Lemma 1.0.16. *Let X be essentially semireflexive and separated over T. Let G be a T-group scheme acting on $X\to T$. Then the kernel of the action is representable by a closed subscheme of G.*

Proof. Proceeding like in [1] we are reduced to proving the analogue of [1, 6.4]. Then the proof given in [1] works in our case, because the only property of free modules that is used in the proof is that they are semireflexive. ☐

The next lemma is the reason we are interested in essentially semireflexive schemes. Indeed, in such a case we have an useful criterion to check if a finite group scheme is an effective model.

Lemma 1.0.17. *Let G be a finite and flat R-group scheme which acts on an essentially semireflexive R-scheme. Then the action of G is faithful if and only if the action of G_k on the special fibre is faithful.*

Proof. Only the *if* part needs a proof. Let I_G be the augmentation ideal of G and let J be the ideal defining the kernel H of the action. Since H is a subgroup scheme of G and H_k is trivial, then

$$J\subseteq I_G \quad \text{and } I_G+\pi R[G]=J+\pi R[G] \tag{1}$$

Moreover, since $R[G]/I_G$ is flat over R then

$$I_G \cap \pi R[G] = \pi I_G. \tag{2}$$

We now claim that

$$I_G = J + \pi I_G.$$

Clearly $J + \pi I_G \subseteq I_G$. We now prove the converse. Let $a \in I_G$, then from (1) it follows that $a = b + \pi c$ for some $b \in J$ and $c \in R[G]$. Since, $J \subseteq I_G$ then $\pi c \in I_G \cap \pi R[G]$. Therefore, by (2) we have $c \in I_G$. Hence, $I_G \subseteq J + \pi I_G$. We have so proved $I_G = J + \pi I_G$. Then I_G/J is an R-module of finite type and $(I_G/J) \otimes_R k = I_G/(J + \pi I_G) = 0$, so $I_G/J = 0$ by Nakayama's lemma. Hence, the kernel is trivial. □

2. Models of $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})_K$ and $(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})_K$

2.1. **Some group schemes of order p^n and models of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$.** Let G be a constant finite R-group scheme. By definition, the effective model for a G-action over a scheme Y is, in particular, a G_K-model $\mathcal{G}$ of G with a morphism $G \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}$. Since G is étale, for any model $\mathcal{G}'$ of G_K the existence of a morphism $G \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}'$ is automatic: $\mathcal{G}'$ is finite over R so you can take the normalization map. In this section we recall results about models of $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})_K$ and $(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})_K$. The results are taken from [27]. See there for the proofs and for more details.

We introduce some R-smooth unidimensional group schemes. For any $\lambda \in R$ define the group scheme

$$\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)} = \operatorname{Spec}(R[T, \frac{1}{1+\lambda T}])$$

The R-group scheme structure is given by

$$\begin{aligned} &T \longmapsto 1 \otimes T + T \otimes 1 + \lambda T \otimes T && \text{comultiplication,}\\ &T \longmapsto 0 && \text{counit,}\\ &T \longmapsto -\frac{T}{1+\lambda T} && \text{coinverse,} \end{aligned}$$

We observe that if $\lambda = 0$ then $\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)} \simeq \mathbb{G}_a$. It is possible to prove that $\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)} \simeq \mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}$ if and only if $v(\lambda) = v(\mu)$ and the isomorphism is given by $T \longmapsto \frac{\lambda}{\mu}T$. Moreover, it is easy to see that, if $\lambda \in \pi R \setminus \{0\}$, then $\mathcal{G}_k^{(\lambda)} \simeq \mathbb{G}_a$ and $\mathcal{G}_K^{(\lambda)} \simeq \mathbb{G}_m$. It has been proved by Waterhouse and Weisfeiler, in [28, 2.5], that any deformation, as a group scheme, of $\mathbb{G}_a$ to $\mathbb{G}_m$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}$ for some $\lambda \in \pi R \setminus \{0\}$. If $\lambda \in R \setminus \{0\}$, we can define the morphism

$$\alpha^\lambda : \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)} \longrightarrow \mathbb{G}_m$$

given, on the level of Hopf algebras, by $T \longmapsto 1 + \lambda T$: it is an isomorphism on the generic fiber. If $v(\lambda) = 0$ then α^λ is an isomorphism. For any flat R-scheme X, let us consider the exact sequence on the fppf site X_{fl}

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)} \xrightarrow{\alpha^\lambda} \mathbb{G}_m \longrightarrow i_* \mathbb{G}_{m,X_\lambda} \longrightarrow 0, \tag{3}$$

where i denotes the closed immersion $X_\lambda = X \otimes_R (R/\lambda R) \hookrightarrow X$ (see [25, 1.2]). This gives the following associated long exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}) \longrightarrow H^0(X, \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow H^0(X_\lambda, \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow \\ \longrightarrow H^1(X, \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}) \longrightarrow H^1(X, \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow H^1(X_\lambda, \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow \dots \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

We now define some finite and flat group schemes of order p^n. Let $\lambda \in R$ satisfy the condition

$$(*) \qquad v(p) \geq p^{n-1}(p-1)v(\lambda).$$

Then the map

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{\lambda,n}: \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda^{p^n})}\\ T &\longmapsto P_{\lambda,n}(T) := \frac{(1+\lambda T)^{p^n}-1}{\lambda^{p^n}}\end{aligned}$$

is an isogeny of degree p^n. Let

$$G_{\lambda,n} := \operatorname{Spec}(R[T]/P_{\lambda,n}(T))$$

be its kernel. It is a commutative finite flat group scheme over R of rank p^n. It is possible to prove that

$$\begin{aligned}(G_{\lambda,n})_k &\simeq \mu_p && \text{if } v(\lambda)=0;\\ (G_{\lambda,n})_k &\simeq \alpha_{p^n} && \text{if } p^{n-1}(p-1)v(\lambda)<v(p);\\ (G_{\lambda,n})_k &\simeq \alpha_{p^{n-1}}\times\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} && \text{if } p^{n-1}(p-1)v(\lambda)=v(p).\end{aligned}$$

We observe that α^λ is compatible with $\psi_{\lambda,n}$, i.e the following diagram is commutative

(5)
$$\begin{tikzcd}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)} \arrow[r, "\alpha^{\lambda}"] \arrow[d, "\psi_{\lambda,n}"'] & \mathbb{G}_m \arrow[d, "p^n"] \\ \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda^{p^n})} \arrow[r, "\alpha^{\lambda^{p^n}}"] & \mathbb{G}_m\end{tikzcd}$$

Then it induces a map

$$\alpha^{\lambda,n}: G_{\lambda,n} \longrightarrow \mu_{p^n},$$

which is an isomorphism on the generic fiber. And if $v(\lambda)=0$, then $\alpha^{\lambda,n}$ is an isomorphism. We remark that

(6)
$$\operatorname{Hom}_{gr}(G_{\lambda,n}, G_{\lambda',n}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/p^{n-r}\mathbb{Z},$$

where $r=\min\{0\le r'\le n \text{ such that } p^{r'}v(\lambda)\ge v(\lambda')\}$. The morphisms are given by

$$\begin{aligned}G_{\lambda,n} &\longrightarrow G_{\lambda',n}\\ T &\longmapsto \frac{(1+\lambda T)^{p^r i}-1}{\lambda'}\end{aligned}$$

for $i=0,\dots,p^{n-r}-1$. It follows easily that $G_{\lambda,n}\simeq G_{\lambda',n}$ if and only if $v(\lambda)=v(\lambda')$.

From the exact sequence of group schemes

$$0 \longrightarrow G_{\lambda,n} \xrightarrow{i} \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)} \xrightarrow{\psi_{\lambda,n}} \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda^{p^n})} \longrightarrow 0$$

we have the exact sequence of groups

(7)
$$\dots \longrightarrow H^0(X,\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}) \xrightarrow{(\psi_{\lambda,n})_*} H^0(X,\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda^{p^n})}) \longrightarrow H^1(X,G_{\lambda,n}) \xrightarrow{i_*} H^1(X,\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}) \longrightarrow H^1(X,\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda^{p^n})}) \longrightarrow \dots$$

In the following when we speak about $G_{\lambda,n}$ it will be assumed that λ satisfies $(*)$. If R contains a primitive (p^n)-th root of unity ζ_n then, since $v(p)=p^{n-1}(p-1)v(\lambda_{(n)})$, the condition $(*)$ is equivalent to $v(\lambda)\le v(\lambda_{(n)})$. The following result classifies models of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$.

Theorem 2.1.1. *Let us suppose that R contains a primitive p-th root of unity. If G is a finite and flat R-group scheme such that $G_K\simeq\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, then $G\simeq G_{\lambda,1}$ for some $\lambda\in R\setminus\{0\}$.*

Proof. See [18, III 3.2.2]. □

2.2. **Models of $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$.** We firstly recall the definition of some smooth R-group schemes of dimension 2, which are extensions of $\mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}$ by $\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}$, for some $\mu, \lambda \in R \setminus \{0\}$. We remark that it is possible to prove that any action of $\mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}$ on $\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}$ is trivial ([24, I 1.6]). Let $Y = \mathrm{Spec}(R[T_1, \dots, T_m]/(F_1, \dots, F_n))$ be an affine R-scheme of finite type. We recall that, for any R-scheme X, we have that $\mathrm{Hom}_{Sch}(X, Y)$ is in bijective correspondence with the set

$$\{(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)^m | F_1(a_1, \dots, a_m) = 0, \dots, F_n(a_1, \dots, a_m) = 0\}.$$

With an abuse of notation we will identify these two sets. If X and Y are R-group schemes we will also identify $\mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(X, Y)$ with a subset of

$$\{(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)^m | F_1(a_1, \dots, a_m) = 0, \dots, F_n(a_1, \dots, a_m) = 0\}.$$

For any $\lambda \in R \setminus \{0\}$ let us define $S_\lambda := \mathrm{Spec}(R/\lambda R)$. We now fix presentations for the group schemes $\mathbb{G}_m$ and $\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}$ with $\lambda \in \pi R$. Indeed we write $\mathbb{G}_m = \mathrm{Spec}(R[S, 1/S])$ and $\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)} = \mathrm{Spec}(R[S, 1/1 + \lambda S])$. We observe that by definition we have that

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{gr}({\mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}}_{|S_\lambda}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_\lambda}) = \{F(S) \in (R/\lambda R[S, \frac{1}{1+\mu S}])^* | F(S)F(T) = F(S + T + \mu ST)\}$$

We remark that throughout the paper will be a conflict of notation since S will denote both $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ and an indeterminate. But it should not cause any problem. If we apply the functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(\mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}, \cdot)$ to the sequence (3), we obtain, in particular, a map

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(\mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}_{|S_\lambda}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_\lambda}) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}, \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}).$$

This map is given by

$$F \longmapsto \mathcal{E}^{(\mu, \lambda; F)},$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}^{(\mu, \lambda; F)}$$

is a smooth affine commutative group defined as follows: let $\tilde{F}(S) \in R[S]$ be a lifting of $F(S)$, then

$$\mathcal{E}^{(\mu, \lambda; F)} = \mathrm{Spec}(R[S_1, S_2, \frac{1}{1+\mu S_1}, \frac{1}{\tilde{F}(S_1) + \lambda S_2}])$$

(1) law of multiplication

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 \longmapsto & S_1 \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes S_1 + \mu S_1 \otimes S_1 \\ S_2 \longmapsto & S_2 \otimes \tilde{F}(S_1) + \tilde{F}(S_1) \otimes S_2 + \lambda S_2 \otimes S_2 + \\ & \frac{\tilde{F}(S_1) \otimes \tilde{F}(S_1) - \tilde{F}(S_1 \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes S_1 + \mu S_1 \otimes S_1)}{\lambda} \end{aligned}$$

(2) unit

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &\longmapsto 0 \\ S_2 &\longmapsto \frac{1 - \tilde{F}(0)}{\lambda} \end{aligned}$$

(3) inverse

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &\longmapsto -\frac{S_1}{1+\mu S_1} \\ S_2 &\longmapsto \frac{\frac{1}{\tilde{F}(S_1) + \lambda S_2} - \tilde{F}(-\frac{S_1}{1+\mu S_1})}{\lambda} \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we define the following homomorphisms of group schemes

$$\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)} = \mathrm{Spec}(R[S, (1+\lambda S)^{-1}]) \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F)}$$

by

$$S_1 \longmapsto 0$$

$$S_2 \longmapsto S + \frac{1-\tilde{F}(0)}{\lambda}$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}^{(\mu)} = \mathrm{Spec}(R[S, \frac{1}{1+\mu S}])$$

by

$$S \longrightarrow S_1.$$

It is easy to see that

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}^{(\mu)} \longrightarrow 0 \tag{8}$$

is exact. A different choice of the lifting $\tilde{F}(S)$ gives an isomorphic extension. We recall the following theorem.

Theorem 2.2.1. *For any* $\lambda, \mu \in R \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\alpha : \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(\mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}_{|S_\lambda}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_\lambda}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}, \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)})$$

is a surjective morphism of groups. And $\ker(\alpha)$ *is generated by the class of* $1+\mu S$. *In particular any extension of* $\mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}$ *by* $\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}$ *is commutative.*

Proof. See [23, §3] or [24, II 1.2] for the case $\mu, \lambda \in \pi R \setminus \{0\}$ and [24, I 2.7, II 1.4] for the others. □

Example 2.2.2. If $v(\mu) = 0$ or $v(\lambda) = 0$ we have that $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}, \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}) = 0$.

We are interested in the study of the models of $(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})_K$. Let us suppose that R contains a primitive p^2-th root of unity. So $(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})_K \simeq (\mu_{p^2})_K$. By 2.1.1, it is easy to show that any such model is an extension of $G_{\mu,1}$ by $G_{\lambda,1}$ for some $\mu, \lambda \in R \setminus \{0\}$. So the first step is to study the group $\mathrm{Ext}^1(G_{\mu,1}, G_{\lambda,1})$. We remark that it is possible to show that any action of $G_{\mu,1}$ on $G_{\lambda,1}$ is trivial. We now define some extensions of $G_{\mu,1}$ by $G_{\lambda,1}$.

Definition 2.2.3. Let $F \in \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(G_{\mu,1|S_\lambda}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_\lambda})$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$F(S)^p(1+\mu S)^{-j} = 1 \in \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(G_{\mu,1|S_{\lambda^p}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_{\lambda^p}}).$$

Let $\tilde{F}(S) \in R[S]$ be a lifting of F. We denote by $\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F,j)}$ the subgroup scheme of $\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F)}$ given on the level of schemes by

$$\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F,j)} = \mathrm{Spec}\left(R[S_1,S_2]/(\frac{(1+\mu S_1)^p - 1}{\mu^p}, \frac{(\tilde{F}(S_1)+\lambda S_2)^p(1+\mu S_1)^{-j} - 1}{\lambda^p})\right).$$

We moreover define the following homomorphisms of group schemes

$$G_{\lambda,1} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F,j)}$$

by

$$S_1 \longmapsto 0$$

$$S_2 \longmapsto S + \frac{1-\tilde{F}(0)}{\lambda}$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F,j)} \longrightarrow G_{\mu,1}$$

by

$$S \longmapsto S_1.$$

It is easy to see that

$$0 \longrightarrow G_{\lambda,1} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F,j)} \longrightarrow G_{\mu,1} \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact. A different choice of the lifting $\tilde{F}(S)$ gives an isomorphic extension. It is easy to see that, as a group schemes, $(\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F,j)})_K \simeq (\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})_K$ if $j \neq 0$ and $(\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F,0)})_K \simeq (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})_K$.

Remark 2.2.4. In the above definition the integer j is uniquely determined by $F \in \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(G_{\mu,1_{|S_\lambda}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_\lambda})$ if and only if $\lambda^p \nmid \mu$.

We recall the following result.

Proposition 2.2.5. *Let $\lambda, \mu \in R \setminus \{0\}$. The restriction map*

$$i^* : \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(\mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}_{|S_\lambda}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_\lambda}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(G_{\mu,1_{|S_\lambda}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_\lambda})$$

induced by

$$i : G_{\mu,1} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}$$

is surjective. If $p > 2$, $v(p) \geq (p-1)v(\mu) > 0$ and $v(\mu) \geq v(\lambda) > 0$, then we have an isomorphism of groups

$$(\xi^0_{R/\lambda R})_p : (R/\lambda R)^{\mathrm{F}} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(G_{\mu,1_{|S_\lambda}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_\lambda})$$

given by

$$a \longmapsto E_p(aS) := \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \frac{a^i}{i!} S^i.$$

Proof. See [27, 4.15, 4.22]. We remark that there is a similar statement for $v(\mu) < v(\lambda)$ which we omit since, as we will see, it is not of interest in this paper. □

We now remark about definition 2.2.3. Applying the functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(\cdot, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_\lambda})$ to the exact sequence over S_λ

$$0 \longrightarrow G_{\mu,1} \xrightarrow{i} \mathcal{G}^{(\mu)} \xrightarrow{\psi_{\mu,1}} \mathcal{G}^{(\mu^p)} \longrightarrow 0,$$

we have that

$$\ker\left(i^* : \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(\mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}_{|S_\lambda}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_\lambda}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(G_{\mu,1_{|S_\lambda}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_\lambda})\right) = \psi_{\mu,1_*} \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(\mathcal{G}^{(\mu^p)}_{|S_\lambda}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_\lambda}). \tag{9}$$

So let $F(S) \in \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(G_{\mu,1_{|S_\lambda}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_\lambda})$. By 2.2.5 we can choose a representative of $F(S)$ in $\mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(\mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}{}_{|S_\lambda}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_\lambda})$ which we denote again $F(S)$ for simplicity. We remark that $F(S)^p \in \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(\mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}{}_{|S_{\lambda^p}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_{\lambda^p}})$. Therefore, by (9), we have that

$$F(S)^p(1+\mu S)^{-j} = 1 \in \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(G_{\mu,1_{|S_{\lambda^p}}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_{\lambda^p}})$$

is equivalent to saying that there exists $G \in \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(\mathcal{G}^{(\mu^p)}{}_{|S_{\lambda^p}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_{\lambda^p}})$ with the property that

$$F(S)^p(1+\mu S)^{-j} = G(\frac{(1+\mu S)^p - 1}{\mu^p}) \in \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(\mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}{}_{|S_{\lambda^p}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_{\lambda^p}}).$$

This implies that $\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F,j)}$ can be seen as the kernel of the isogeny

$$\begin{aligned} \psi^j_{\mu,\lambda,F,G} : \mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F)} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^{(\mu^p,\lambda^p;G)} \\ S_1 &\longmapsto \frac{(1+\mu S_1)^p - 1}{\mu^p} \\ S_2 &\longmapsto \frac{(\tilde{F}(S_1) + \lambda S_2)^p (1+\mu S_1)^{-j} - \tilde{G}(\frac{(1+\mu S_1)^p - 1}{\mu^p})}{\lambda^p} \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{F}, \tilde{G} \in R[S]$ are liftings of F and G.

Example 2.2.6. Let us define

$$\eta = \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \frac{(-1)^{k-1}}{k} \lambda_{(2)}^k.$$

We remark that $v(\eta) = v(\lambda_{(2)})$. We consider

$$F(S) = E_p(\eta S) = \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \frac{(\eta S)^k}{k!}.$$

It was showed in [26, §5] that, using our notation,

$$\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z} \simeq \mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_{(1)}, \lambda_{(1)}; E_p(\eta T), 1)}$$

as group schemes. A similar description of $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$ was independently found by Green and Matignon ([8]).

Example 2.2.7. It is easy to see that $G_{\lambda,2}$ is isomorphic, as a group scheme, to $\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda^p, \lambda; 1, 1)}$.

Let us define, for any $\mu, \lambda \in R$ with $v(\mu), v(\lambda) \leq v(\lambda_{(1)})$, the group

$$rad_{p,\lambda}(< 1 + \mu S >) := \Big\{ (F(S), j) \in \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(G_{\mu,1_{|S_\lambda}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_\lambda}) \times \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } F(S)^p (1 + \mu S)^{-j} = 1 \in \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(G_{\mu,1_{|S_{\lambda^p}}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_{\lambda^p}}) \Big\}.$$

We can define the map

$$\beta : rad_{p,\lambda}(< 1 + \mu S >) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(G_{\mu,1}, G_{\lambda,1})$$

by

$$(F(S), j) \longmapsto \mathcal{E}^{(\mu, \lambda; F(S), j)}$$

It has been proved in [27, 4.38, 4.39] that it is an injective morphism of groups. The image of β is the set $\{\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F(S),j)}\}$, which is therefore a group isomorphic to $rad_{p,\lambda}(< 1 + \mu S >)$.

Theorem 2.2.8. *Let us suppose $p > 2$. Let $\mu, \lambda \in R \setminus \{0\}$ be with $v(\lambda_{(1)}) \geq v(\mu) \geq v(\lambda)$. Then, $rad_{p,\lambda}(< 1 + \mu S >)$ is isomorphic to the group*

$$\Phi_{\mu,\lambda} := \Big\{ (a, j) \in (R/\lambda R)^{\mathrm{F}} \times \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \textit{ such that } pa - j\mu = \frac{p}{\mu^{p-1}} a^p \in R/\lambda^p R \Big\},$$

through the map

$$(a, j) \longmapsto (E_p(aS), j)$$

Proof. [27, 4.47] □

Remark 2.2.9. It is clear that if $(0, j) \in \Phi_{\mu,\lambda}$, with $j \neq 0$, then $\mu \equiv 0 \mod \lambda^p$.

Remark 2.2.10. From the proof of this theorem, it also follows that $\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda,F,j)}$, with $F(S) = E_p(aS) \in \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(G_{\mu,1_{|S_\lambda}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_\lambda})$, is the kernel of the isogeny $\psi^j_{\mu,\lambda,F,G}$, with $G(S) = E_p(a^p S) \in \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(G_{\mu,1_{|S_{\lambda^p}}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_{\lambda^p}})$.

We recall that we are interested in group schemes which are generically isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$ and not in extensions. We call

$$\Phi^1_{\mu,\lambda} := \{ a \in R/\lambda R | (a, 1) \in \Phi_{\mu,\lambda} \};$$

it is only a set. The following result says that every extension represented by an element of $\Phi^1_{\mu,\lambda}$ is a model of $(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})_K$ as a group scheme.

Theorem 2.2.11. *Let us suppose that R contains a primitive p^2-th root of unity. Let G be a model of $(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})_K$. Then there exist unique $v(\lambda_{(1)}) \geq m \geq n \geq 0$ and $a \in \Phi^1_{\pi^m,\pi^n}$ such that $G \simeq \mathcal{E}^{(\pi^m, \pi^n; E_p(aS), 1)}$ and moreover $\Phi^1_{\pi^m,\pi^n}$ is one of the following.*

a) *If $m < pn$, $\Phi^1_{\pi^m,\pi^n}$ is nonempty if and only if $pm - n \geq v(p)$, and it is the set*

$$\Big\{\eta\frac{\pi^m}{\lambda_{(1)}} + \alpha \in R/\pi^n R \text{ s.t., for any lifting } \tilde{\alpha} \in R \text{ of } \alpha \in R/\pi^n R,$$
$$pv(\tilde{\alpha}) \geq \max\{pn + (p-1)m - v(p), n\}\Big\}.$$

For the definition of η see 2.2.6.

b) *If $m \geq pn$ then $\Phi^1_{\pi^m,\pi^n}$ is the set*

$$\Big\{\alpha \in R/\lambda R \text{ s. t., for any lifting } \tilde{\alpha} \in R,\ pv(\tilde{\alpha}) \geq \max\{pn + (p-1)m - v(p), n\}\Big\}$$

Conversely if $a \in \Phi^1_{\pi^m,\pi^n}$ then $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^m,\pi^n;E_p(aS),1)}$ is a model of $(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})_K$.

Proof. See [27, 4.51 and 4.58]. The notation $\Phi^1_{\pi^m,\pi^n}$ is not used there. □

Remark 2.2.12. Let us suppose $m < pn$. Let $b \in \Phi^1_{\pi^m,\pi^n}$. By 2.2.9, then $b \neq 0$. Let $\tilde{b} \in R$ be any of its lifting. Then $v(\tilde{b}) = v(\eta\frac{\pi^m}{\lambda_{(1)}}) = m - \frac{v(p)}{p}$. Indeed, by the theorem, we have $\tilde{b} = \eta\frac{\pi^m}{\lambda_{(1)}} + \alpha$ for some $\alpha \in R/\pi^n R$ with $v(\tilde{\alpha}) > v(\eta\frac{\pi^m}{\lambda_{(1)}}) = m - \frac{v(p)}{p}$, where $\tilde{\alpha} \in R$ is any lifting of α.

The following proposition tells us, in particular, when two extensions as above are isomorphic as group schemes.

Proposition 2.2.13. *Let $a_i \in \Phi^1_{\mu,\lambda}$, for $i = 1, 2$. We set $F_i(S) = E_p(a_i S)$. Let*

$$f : \mathcal{E}^{(\mu_1,\lambda_1;F_1,1)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^{(\mu_2,\lambda_2;F_2,1)},$$

be a model map between models of $(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})_K$. Then it is a morphism of extensions and it is given by

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &\longmapsto \frac{(1+\mu_1 S_1)^{\frac{rj_1}{j_2}} - 1}{\mu_2} \\ S_2 &\longmapsto \frac{(F_1(S_1) + \lambda_1 S_2)^r (1+\mu_1 S_1)^s - F_2(\frac{(1+\mu_1 S_1)^{\frac{rj_1}{j_2}} - 1}{\mu_2})}{\lambda_2} \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

for some $r \in (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^*$ and $s \in \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, it exists if and only if $v(\mu_1) \geq v(\mu_2)$, $v(\lambda_1) \geq v(\lambda_2)$ and

$$a_1 \equiv \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2} a_2 \mod \lambda_2. \tag{11}$$

Moreover, any such f is an isomorphism if and only if $v(\mu_1) = v(\mu_2)$ and $v(\lambda_1) = v(\lambda_2)$.

Proof. See [27, 4.54, 4.55]. There the statements are slightly more general. □

2.3. **Torsors under $G_{\lambda,n}$ and $\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F(S),j)}$.**

We begin describing explicitly $G_{\lambda,n}$-torsors.

Proposition 2.3.1. *Let X be a faithfully flat R-scheme and let $f : X_{fl} \longrightarrow X_{Zar}$ be the natural continuous morphism of sites. Then $R^1 f_*(\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}) = 0$. In particular $H^1(X, \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}) = H^1(X_{Zar}, \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)})$.*

Proof. It is sufficient to prove that $H^1(\text{Spec}(A), \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}) = 0$ for any local ring A flat over R. If $\lambda = 0$, then $\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)} \simeq \mathbb{G}_a$ and the statement is classical ([14, III 2.14,3.7]). Let us now suppose $\lambda \neq 0$. We recall that we have the following exact sequence (see (4))

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0(\text{Spec}(A), \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}) \longrightarrow H^0(\text{Spec}(A), \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow H^0(\text{Spec}(A/\lambda A), \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow$$
$$\longrightarrow H^1(\text{Spec}(A), \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}) \longrightarrow H^1(\text{Spec}(A), \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow H^1(\text{Spec}(A/\lambda A), \mathbb{G}_m).$$

But, since A is local, then $H^0(\mathrm{Spec}(A), \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow H^0(\mathrm{Spec}(A/\lambda A), \mathbb{G}_m)$ is surjective. Moreover by Hilbert 90 (see [14, III.4.9]) we have $H^1(\mathrm{Spec}(A), \mathbb{G}_m) = \mathrm{Pic}(\mathrm{Spec}(A))$. But, since A is local then $\mathrm{Pic}(\mathrm{Spec}(A)) = 0$. So $H^1(\mathrm{Spec}(A), \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}) = 0$, as necessary. Since $R^1 f_*(\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}) = 0$, it follows by the Leray spectral sequence that

$$H^1(X, \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}) = H^1(X_{Zar}, \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}).$$

□

If $Y \longrightarrow X$ is a G-torsor, we will denote by $[Y]$ the class of the G-torsor in $H^1(X, G)$. Now let $Y \longrightarrow X$ be a $G_{\lambda,n}$-torsor. Let us consider the exact sequence (7). By 2.3.1 we can take a covering $\{U_i = \mathrm{Spec}(A_i)\}$ of X by affine subschemes such that the class $(i_*[Y])_{|U_i}$ is trivial, where $i : G_{\lambda,n} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}$. This means that

$$Y_{|U_i} = \mathrm{Spec}\left(A_i[T_i]/(\frac{(1+\lambda T_i)^{p^n} - 1}{\lambda^{p^n}} - f_i)\right) \tag{12}$$

for some $f_i \in A_i$ such that $1 + \lambda^{p^n} f_i \in A_i^*$. Moreover, $1 + \lambda T_i = f_{ij}(1 + \lambda T_j)$ with $\{f_{ij} = 1 + \lambda g_{ij}\} = i_*[Y] \in H^1(X, \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)})$.

Remark 2.3.2. Andreatta and Gasbarri (see [4]) have given a description of $G_{\lambda,n}$-torsors from which they deduced that a $G_{\lambda,n}$-torsor is locally (12). From this fact they deduced that $H^1(X, \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}) = H^1(X_{Zar}, \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)})$.

We now give an explicit description of $\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F(S),j)}$-torsors. Let $\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F(S),j)}$ be a group scheme as in the previous subsection. We have seen that there is the following exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F(S),j)} \xrightarrow{\iota} \mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F(S))} \xrightarrow{\psi^j_{\mu,\lambda,F,G}} \mathcal{E}^{(\mu^p,\lambda^p;G(S))} \longrightarrow 0$$

for $G(S) \in \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(G^{(\mu^p)}{}_{|S_{\lambda^p}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_{\lambda^p}})$ such that $F(S)^p(1+\mu S)^{-j} = G(\frac{(1+\mu S)^p - 1}{\mu^p}) \in \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(\mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}{}_{|S_{\lambda^p}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_{\lambda^p}})$. The associated long exact sequence is

(13)

$$\begin{aligned}\ldots \longrightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F(S))}) \xrightarrow{(\psi^j_{\mu,\lambda,F,G})_*} H^0(X, \mathcal{E}^{(\mu^p,\lambda^p;G(S))}) \xrightarrow{\delta} H^1(X, \mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F(S),j)}) \xrightarrow{\iota_*} \\ \longrightarrow H^1(X, \mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F(S))}) \longrightarrow H^1(X, \mathcal{E}^{(\mu^p,\lambda^p;G(S))}) \longrightarrow \ldots\end{aligned}$$

Corollary 2.3.3. *Let X be a faithfully flat R-scheme and let $f : X_{fl} \longrightarrow X_{Zar}$ be the natural continuous morphism of sites. For any R-group scheme $\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F)}$, we have $R^1 f_*(\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F)}) = 0$. In particular, $H^1(X, \mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F)}) = H^1(X_{Zar}, \mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F)})$.*

Proof. Let us consider the exact sequence (8), in the fppf topology,

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}^{(\mu)} \longrightarrow 0.$$

If we apply the functor f_*, we obtain

$$\ldots \longrightarrow R^1 f_* \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)} \longrightarrow R^1 f_*(\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F)}) \longrightarrow R^1 f_* \mathcal{G}^{(\mu)} \longrightarrow \ldots$$

By 2.3.1 it follows that $R^1 f_*(\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}) = R^1 f_*(\mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}) = 0$. Hence, $R^1 f_*(\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F)}) = 0$. As in 2.3.1, we conclude that $H^1(X, \mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F)}) = H^1(X_{Zar}, \mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F)})$. □

Let $\tilde{F}(S), \tilde{G}(S)$ be liftings of $F(S)$ and $G(S)$ in $R[S]$. We remark that

$$\begin{aligned}H^0(X, \mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F(S))}) = \{&(f_1, f_2) \in H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \times H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) | \\ &1 + \mu f_1 \in H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)^* \text{ and } \tilde{F}(f_1) + \lambda f_2 \in H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)^*\},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}H^0(X, \mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;G(S))}) = \{&(f_1, f_2) \in H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \times H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) | \\ &1 + \mu^p f_1 \in H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)^* \text{ and } \tilde{G}(f_1) + \lambda^p f_2 \in H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)^*\}.\end{aligned}$$

The map $(\psi^{j}_{\mu,\lambda,F,G})_* : H^0(X,\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F(S))}) \longrightarrow H^0(X,\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;G(S))})$ is given by

$$(f_1,f_2)\longmapsto \Big(\frac{(1+\mu f_1)^p-1}{\mu^p},\frac{(\tilde{F}(f_1)+\lambda f_2)^p(1+\mu f_1)^{-j}-\tilde{G}(\frac{(1+\mu f_1)^p-1}{\mu^p})}{\lambda^p}\Big).$$

Now let us suppose that $X=\operatorname{Spec}(A)$. We describe explicitly the map δ. We have

$$H^0(X,\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;G(S))})=\{(f_1,f_2)\in A\times A \mid 1+\mu^p f_1\in A^* \text{ and } \tilde{G}(f_1)+\lambda^p f_2\in A^*\}.$$

and $\delta((f_1,f_2))$ is, as a scheme,

$$Y=\operatorname{Spec} A[T_1,T_2]/\Big(\frac{(1+\mu T_1)^p-1}{\mu^p}-f_1,\frac{(\tilde{F}(T_1)+\lambda T_2)^p(1+\mu T_1)^{-j}-\tilde{G}(f_1)}{\lambda^p}-f_2\Big), \tag{14}$$

and the $\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F(S),j)}$-action over Y is given by

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &\longmapsto S_1+T_1+\mu S_1T_1\\ T_2 &\longmapsto S_2\tilde{F}(T_1)+\tilde{F}(S_1)T_2+\lambda S_2T_2+\\ &\qquad\qquad \frac{\tilde{F}(S_1)\tilde{F}(T_1)-\tilde{F}(S_1+T_1+\mu S_1T_1)}{\lambda} \end{aligned}$$

Now let X be a faithfully R-scheme. If $Y\longrightarrow X$ is a $\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F(S),j)}$-torsor then, by 2.3.3 there exists a Zariski covering $\{U_i=\operatorname{Spec}(A_i)\}$ such that $(\iota_*)_{U_i}([Y])=0$, for any i. This means that

$$Y_{|U_i}=\operatorname{Spec} A_i[T_1,T_2]/\Big(\frac{(1+\mu T_1)^p-1}{\mu^p}-f_{1,i},\frac{(\tilde{F}(T_1)+\lambda T_2)^p(1+\mu T_1)^{-j}-\tilde{G}(f_1)}{\lambda^p}-f_{2,i}\Big),$$

for some $f_{1,i},f_{2,i}$ as above. By a standard argument we can see that the cocycle $\iota_*([Y])\in H^1(X_{Zar},\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F)})$ permits to patch together the torsors $Y_{|U_i}$ to obtain Y. In §6, we will consider the case X affine and we are interested only in $\mathcal{E}^{(\mu,\lambda;F,j)}$-torsors of the form (14).

3. A FILTRATION OF $H^1(X,\mu_{p^n})$

We firstly recall the following result.

Proposition 3.0.1. *Let X be a normal integral scheme. Let $f:Y\longrightarrow X$ be a morphism with a rational section and let $g:G\longrightarrow G'$ be a map of finite and flat commutative group schemes over X, which is an isomorphism over* $\operatorname{Spec}(K(X))$. *Then*

$$f^*g_*:H^1(X,G)\longrightarrow H^1(Y,G'_Y)$$

is injective.

Proof. See [27, 4.29]. □

Remark 3.0.2. The previous result will be applied to the case $f=\mathrm{id}_X$ or to the case $f:U\longrightarrow X$ an open immersion and $g=\mathrm{id}_G$.

We refer to §2 for the notation. For any $\lambda,\mu\in R$ with $v(\lambda)\geq v(\mu)$ we have a morphism $\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}\longrightarrow\mathcal{G}^{(\mu)}$ defined by $T\longmapsto\frac{\lambda}{\mu}T$. If $v(p)\geq p^{n-1}(p-1)v(\lambda)$, it is compatible with $\psi_{\lambda,n}$ and $\psi_{\mu,n}$. So it induces a morphism $G_{\lambda,n}\longrightarrow G_{\mu,n}$ such that

$$\begin{tikzcd} G_{\lambda,n} \arrow[rr] \arrow[dr, "\alpha^{\lambda,n}"'] & & G_{\mu,n} \arrow[dl, "\alpha^{\mu,n}"] \\ & \mu_{p^n} & \end{tikzcd}$$

commutes. Let X be a normal integral faithfully flat R-scheme. We obtain the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
H^1(X, G_{\lambda,n}) \arrow[rr] \arrow[dr, "(\alpha^{\lambda,n})_*"] & & H^1(X, G_{\mu,n}) \arrow[dl, "(\alpha^{\mu,n})_*"'] \\
& H^1(X, \mu_{p^n}) &
\end{tikzcd}$$

and, applying 3.0.1, we have that $(\alpha^{\lambda,n})_*$ and $(\alpha^{\mu,n})_*$ are injective. Hence, $H^1(X, G_{\lambda,n}) \longrightarrow H^1(X, G_{\mu,n})$ is injective. So we have proved the following proposition.

Proposition 3.0.3. *Let X be a normal integral faithfully flat R-scheme and let $i_0 = \max\{i | v(p) \geq p^{n-1}(p-1)v(\pi^i)\}$. Then, for any n, we have the following filtration*

$$0 \subseteq H^1(X, G_{\pi^{i_0},n}) \subseteq H^1(X, G_{\pi^{i_0-1},n}) \subseteq \ldots \subseteq H^1(X, G_{\pi,n}) \subseteq H^1(X, \mu_{p^n}).$$

When comparable the above filtration coincides with that of [20, 5.2]. Moreover it coincides with that of [17, p.262] if $n = 1$ and $X = \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ with A the integer ring of a local number field. If R contains a primitive p^n-th root of unity, then $i_0 = v(\lambda_{(n)})$.

4. WEAK EXTENSION OF TORSORS UNDER COMMUTATIVE GROUP SCHEMES

The aim of this section is to prove a result of weak extension for torsors under commutative group schemes over normal schemes with some hypothesis.

4.1. Preliminary results.

We here state some results which will be useful in what follows.

Proposition 4.1.1. *Let $i = 1, 2$. Let Z_i be a faithfully flat S-scheme and let G_i be an affine flat S-group scheme, together with an admissible action, over a faithfully flat Z_i-schemes Y_i. Moreover, we suppose that $Y_2 \longrightarrow Z_2$ is a G_2-torsor and that there exists a morphism*

$$\varphi_K : (G_1)_K \longrightarrow (G_2)_K.$$

Let us suppose we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
Y_1 \arrow[r, "f"] \arrow[d] & Y_2 \arrow[d] \\
Z_1 \arrow[r] & Z_2
\end{tikzcd}$$

of S-schemes such that f_K is an isomorphism compatible with the actions. Then there exists a unique morphism

$$\varphi : G_1 \longrightarrow G_2$$

which extends φ_K and such that f is compatible with the actions.

Proof. For $i = 1, 2$ we call $\sigma_i : G_i \times_R Y_i \longrightarrow Y_i$ the actions. Since $Y_2 \longrightarrow Z_2$ is a G_2-torsor, then $\sigma_2 \times \mathrm{id}$ is an isomorphism. So by

$$G_1 \times_R Y_1 \overset{\sigma_1 \times \mathrm{id}}{\longrightarrow} Y_1 \times_{Z_1} Y_1 \overset{f \times f}{\longrightarrow} Y_2 \times_{Z_2} Y_2 \overset{(\sigma_2 \times \mathrm{id})^{-1}}{\longrightarrow} G_2 \times_R Y_2$$

we obtain a morphism

$$G_1 \times_R Y_1 \longrightarrow G_2 \times_R Y_2.$$

If we compose it with the projection $p_1 : G_2 \times_R Y_2 \longrightarrow G_2$, we obtain a morphism

$$G_1 \times_R Y_1 \longrightarrow G_2.$$

Moreover, we consider the projection

$$p_2 : G_1 \times_R Y_1 \longrightarrow Y_1.$$

Therefore, we have a map

$$\varphi_{Y_1} : G_1 \times_R Y_1 \longrightarrow G_2 \times_R Y_1. \tag{15}$$

We now prove that it is compatible with φ_K, i.e. φ_{Y_1} and φ_K induce the same morphism $G_1 \times_R (Y_1)_K \longrightarrow G_2 \times_R (Y_1)_K$. We observe that φ_{Y_1} and φ_K induce two morphisms, $(\varphi_{Y_1})_K$ and $(\varphi_K)_{Y_1}$ respectively, which are compatible with f_K. For any $\psi : G_1 \times_R (Y_1)_K \longrightarrow G_2 \times_R (Y_1)_K$, to be compatible with f_K means that the following diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
G_1 \times_R (Y_1)_K \arrow[r, "\sigma_1"] \arrow[d, "(\mathrm{id} \times f_K) \circ \psi"'] & (Y_1)_K \arrow[d, "f_K"] \\
G_2 \times_R (Y_2)_K \arrow[r, "\sigma_2"] & (Y_2)_K
\end{tikzcd}$$

commutes, i.e. $\sigma_2 \circ (\mathrm{id} \times f_K) \circ \psi = f_K \circ \sigma_1$. So we have

$$\sigma_2 \circ (\mathrm{id} \times f_K) \circ (\varphi_{Y_1})_K = \sigma_2 \circ (\mathrm{id} \times f_K) \circ (\varphi_K)_{Y_1} = f_K \circ \sigma_1.$$

Moreover, since $p_2 \circ (\mathrm{id} \times f_K) = f_K \circ p_2$ and $p_2 \circ (\varphi_{Y_1})_K = p_2 \circ (\varphi_K)_{Y_1} = p_2$ it follows that

$$p_2 \circ (\mathrm{id} \times f_K) \circ (\varphi_{Y_1})_K = p_2 \circ (\mathrm{id} \times f_K) \circ (\varphi_K)_{Y_1} = f_K \circ p_2.$$

Since $(Y_2)_K \longrightarrow (Z_2)_K$ is a $(G_2)_K$-torsor, then

$$(\mathrm{id} \times f_K) \circ (\varphi_{Y_1})_K = (\mathrm{id} \times f_K) \circ (\varphi_K)_{Y_1}.$$

For $i = 1, 2$, let p_i be the projections from $G_2 \times_R (Y_1)_K$ and let p'_i be the projections from $G_2 \times_R (Y_2)_K$. Then

$$p_1 \circ (\varphi_{Y_1})_K = p'_1 \circ (\mathrm{id} \times f_K) \circ (\varphi_{Y_1})_K = p'_1 \circ (\mathrm{id} \times f_K) \circ (\varphi_K)_{Y_1} = p_1 \circ (\varphi_K)_{Y_1}.$$

and

$$f_K \circ p_2 \circ (\varphi_{Y_1})_K = p'_2 \circ (\mathrm{id} \times f_K) \circ (\varphi_{Y_1})_K = p'_2 \circ (\mathrm{id} \times f_K) \circ (\varphi_K)_{Y_1} = f_K \circ p_2 \circ (\varphi_K)_{Y_1}.$$

Since f_K is an isomorphism, then $p_2 \circ (\varphi_{Y_1})_K = p_2 \circ (\varphi_K)_{Y_1}$. Hence, $(\varphi_{Y_1})_K = (\varphi_K)_{Y_1}$, i.e. φ_K is compatible with φ_{Y_1}. By the next descent lemma we have a unique morphism of schemes $\varphi : G_1 \longrightarrow G_2$ which extends φ_K and φ_{Y_1}. Since G_1 is flat over R, φ_K is a morphism of group schemes and G_2 a separated scheme over R, then φ is a morphism of group schemes. By construction it is clear that, through φ, the morphism f preserves the actions. □

We now prove the descent lemma used in the previous proof.

Lemma 4.1.2. *Let $S' \to S$ be a faithfully flat morphism. Let X_1, X_2 be affine S-schemes with X_2 flat over S. Given two morphisms $\varphi_K : (X_1)_K \to (X_2)_K$ and $\varphi_{S'} : X_1 \times_S S' \to X_2 \times_S S'$ that coincide on S'_K, there is a unique morphism $\varphi : X_1 \to X_2$ that extends them.*

Proof. Up to restricting ourselves to an affine subscheme of S', we can suppose $S' = \mathrm{Spec}(A)$. For $i = 1, 2$, let us consider $X_i = \mathrm{Spec}(B_i)$. In terms of function rings we have two morphisms

$$\varphi_A^\sharp := \varphi_{S'}^\sharp : B_2 \otimes_R A \longrightarrow B_1 \otimes_R A \tag{16}$$

and

$$\varphi_K^\sharp : B_2 \otimes_R K \longrightarrow B_1 \otimes_R K. \tag{17}$$

Moreover, by compatibility, it follows that the above morphisms induce the same map

$$\varphi_{A_K}^\sharp := \varphi_A^\sharp \otimes \mathrm{id}_K = (\varphi_K^\sharp) \otimes \mathrm{id}_{A_K} : B_2 \otimes_R A \otimes_R K \longrightarrow B_1 \otimes_R A \otimes_R K.$$

First of all we prove the uniqueness of φ. Since X_2 is flat over S, then the inclusion $(X_2)_K \longrightarrow X_2$ induces an injection $B_2 \hookrightarrow B_2 \otimes_R K$. Therefore, if (any) φ exists then it is given, on the level of function rings, by the restriction of $\varphi_K^\sharp$ to B_2. Therefore it is unique.

We now prove the existence of φ. We have the following commutative diagram with the obvious maps

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & B_i \otimes_R A \arrow[dr] & \\
B_i \arrow[ur] \arrow[dr] & & B_i \otimes_R A \otimes_R K \\
 & B_i \otimes_R K \arrow[ur] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Since $S' \longrightarrow S$ is flat, in particular, the induced map $R \longrightarrow A$ is injective. Moreover, B_2 is a flat R-algebra, then for $i = 2$ all the maps of the above diagram are injective. We remark that (16) and (17) imply $\varphi^\sharp_{A_K}(B_2) \subseteq (B_1 \otimes_R K) \cap (B_1 \otimes_R A)$. We claim that $\varphi^\sharp_{A_K}(B_2) \subseteq B_1$. Let us suppose that there exists $b \in B_2$ such that $\varphi^\sharp_{A_K}(b) \notin B_1$. Then there exists $n \geq 1$ such that $\pi^n \varphi^\sharp_{A_K}(b) \in B_1$ and $\pi^{n-1}\varphi^\sharp_{A_K}(b) \notin B_1$. Hence,

$$\pi^n \varphi^\sharp_{A_K}(b) \in B_1 \cap \pi(B_1 \otimes_R A).$$

We remark that since $S' \longrightarrow S$ is surjective, then $S'_k = \mathrm{Spec}(A/\pi A)$ is nonempty. Now, since any scheme over a field is flat,

$$B_1/\pi B_1 \longrightarrow (B_1 \otimes_R A)/\pi(B_1 \otimes_R A) \simeq B_1/\pi B_1 \otimes_k A/\pi A$$

is injective. Therefore,

$$B_1 \cap \pi(B_1 \otimes_R A) = \pi B_1,$$

which implies $\pi^{n-1}\varphi^\sharp_{A_K}(b) \in B_1$. This is a contradiction. So $\varphi^\sharp_{A_K}$ induces a morphism

$$\varphi^\sharp : B_2 \longrightarrow B_1.$$

We have so proved that $\varphi_K : (Y_1)_K \longrightarrow (Y_2)_K$ is extendible to a morphism $\varphi : Y_1 \longrightarrow Y_2$. □

The following easy consequence of the previous lemma will not be used in the rest of the paper.

Proposition 4.1.3. *Let G be an affine flat and commutative S-group scheme. Then*

$$H^1(S, G) \longrightarrow H^1(K, G_K)$$

is injective.

Proof. Let $f : Y \longrightarrow S$ be a G-torsor. This means that there exists a faithfully flat S-scheme T such that $Y_T := Y \times_X T \longmapsto T$ is trivial (for instance we can chose $T = Y$). Then it has a section $\varphi_T : T \longrightarrow Y_T$. Moreover let us suppose that $Y \longrightarrow S$ is trivial as G_K-torsor on X_K. Then there is a section $\varphi_K : \mathrm{Spec}(K) \longrightarrow Y_K$ of $Y_K \longrightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(K)$. Since G is affine then $f : Y \longrightarrow S$ is an affine morphism. So Y is affine. From the previous lemma the thesis follows. □

Lemma 4.1.4. *Let X, Y be integral faithfully flat schemes over S. Moreover, let us suppose that X is normal. If $f : Y \longrightarrow X$ is an integral dominant S-morphism then, f_k is schematically dominant, i.e. $f^\sharp_k : \mathcal{O}_{X_k} \longrightarrow f_*\mathcal{O}_{Y_k}$ is injective. In particular, if Y_k is integral (resp. reduced) then X_k is also integral (resp. reduced).*

Proof. Since any integral morphism is affine by the definition, it is enough to prove the lemma in the affine case. So we can suppose $X = \mathrm{Spec}(A)$, $Y = \mathrm{Spec}(B)$ with an integral injection $A \hookrightarrow B$. We will prove that $A_k \hookrightarrow B_k$. This is equivalent to proving $\pi B \cap A = \pi A$. One inclusion is obvious. Now let $a \in \pi B \cap A$, then $a = \pi b$ with $b \in B$. We remark that $b = \frac{a}{\pi} \in A_K \cap B$ is integral over A. But A is integrally closed by hypothesis. Therefore $b \in A$.

It follows immediately the last statement. □

Lemma 4.1.5. *Let X be a flat S-scheme. If X_K is normal and X_k reduced, then X is normal.*

Proof. For a proof see [13, 4.1.18]. ☐

4.2. **Weak extension.** We now consider an integral normal faithfully flat S-scheme X. Let $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ be a connected G_K-torsor, for some finite group-scheme G_K over K, and Y the normalization of X in Y_K. We remark that Y_K is also normal ([2, I 9.10]). In particular Y_K is integral, hence Y is integral. We denote by g the morphism $Y \longrightarrow X$.

Lemma 4.2.1. *Y is normal.*

Proof. By definition of normalization we have that g is an affine morphism. Since being normal is a local property we can suppose that $X = \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ and $Y = \mathrm{Spec}(B)$. We have to prove that B is integrally closed. Since Y_K is normal, then B_K is integrally closed. So, if $b \in Frac(B)$ is integral over B, then $b \in B_K$. However, B is integral over A, then b is integral over A. But B is the integral closure of A in B_K, therefore $b \in B$. ☐

From the proof it follows that, since X is normal, in fact Y is the normalization of X in $K(Y)$, the function field of Y. Therefore $g : Y \longrightarrow X$ is finite (see [13, 4.1.25]). We remark that Y has also the following property.

Lemma 4.2.2. *Let Z be a faithfully flat S-scheme, let $f : Z \longrightarrow X$ be a dominant integral S-morphism and let $h_K : Y_K \longrightarrow Z_K$ be a dominant X_K-morphism. Then there exists an integral X-morphism $h : Y \longrightarrow Z$ which extends h_K. Moreover if Z is normal and h_K is an isomorphism then h is an isomorphism.*

Proof. We have that $g : Y \longrightarrow X$ and $f : Z \longrightarrow X$ are affine. So, first, we consider the case $X = \mathrm{Spec}(A)$, $Y = \mathrm{Spec}(B)$ and $Z = \mathrm{Spec}(C)$. By hypothesis, we can suppose

$$A \subseteq C \subseteq C_K \subseteq B_K$$

with C integral over A. But, since B is the integral closure of A in B_K, then $C \subseteq B$. So we have

$$A \subseteq C \subseteq B.$$

These inclusions are functorial, so we have an injective morphism of $\mathcal{O}_X$-algebras $f_*(\mathcal{O}_Z) \subseteq g_*(\mathcal{O}_Y)$. We remark that $Y = \mathcal{S}pec(g_*\mathcal{O}_Y)$ and $Z = \mathcal{S}pec(f_*\mathcal{O}_Z)$. This implies that there exists an integral morphism $h : Y \longrightarrow Z$ such that $g = f \circ h$.

Now if Z is normal then, by definition of the integral closure of X in Y_K, clearly $f_*\mathcal{O}_Z = g_*\mathcal{O}_Y$ and so we have that h is an isomorphism.

☐

We now prove a result of weak extension of $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$-torsors. For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and any scheme Z we define ${}_mPic(Z) := \ker(Pic(Z) \xrightarrow{m} Pic(Z))$.

Proposition 4.2.3. *Let $m \geq 1$ be an integer. Let X be a normal faithfully flat scheme over R with integral fibers and ${}_mPic(X_K) = {}_mPic(X)$. Let $f_K : Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ be a connected $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$-torsor. Let Y be the normalization of X in Y_K and suppose that Y_k is reduced. If R contains a primitive m-th root of unity, there exists a unique μ_m-torsor Y' over X which extends f_K.*

Remark 4.2.4. Let us consider the restriction map ${}_mPic(X) \longrightarrow {}_mPic(X_K)$. If X is a normal faithfully flat scheme over R with integral fibers, then the above map is injective for any m (see [11, II 6.5] and [13, 7.2.14]; the hypothesis of separatedness cited in [11, II 6.5] is not necessary). The above map is an isomorphism, for any m, if, for instance, X is also separated and locally factorial (e.g. regular). See [11, II 6.5, II 6.11].

Remark 4.2.5. It has been proved by Epp([6]) that if, for instance, X is of finite type over R (or $X = \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ with A the localization or the π-adic completion of an R-algebra of finite type) then, up to an extension of R, it is possible to suppose Y_k reduced. Moreover the hypothesis ${}_mPic(X_K) = {}_mPic(X)$ is necessary. Indeed, to any $\mathcal{L} \in {}_mPic(X_K)$, by the Kummer theory, we can associate (at least) a μ_m-torsor $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$. It is clear that if $\mathcal{L}$ is not extendible the same is true for the μ_m-torsor $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$.

Proof. First, we consider the affine case $X = \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ and

$$Y_K = \mathrm{Spec}(A_K[Z]/(Z^m - f))$$

with $f \in A_K^*$. Since $Y \longrightarrow X$ is a finite morphism, then $Y = \mathrm{Spec}(B)$ for some normal and finite A-algebra B. Multiplying f by an m-th power of π if necessary, which does not change the μ_m-torsor $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$, we can suppose $f \in A$ and $f = \pi^n f_0$, with $0 \leq n < m$ and $f_0 \notin \pi A$. This is possible since A is integral and noetherian, so from Krull's Theorem ([13, 1.3.13]) we have $\cap_{m \geq 0} \pi^m A = 0$.

We call $Y' = \mathrm{Spec}(A[Z]/(Z^m - f))$. We prove that Y' is a μ_m-torsor over X, i.e. $f \in A^*$. Since Y' is flat over R and Y_K is connected and normal then Y' is integral. Moreover $Y' \longrightarrow X$ is an integral morphism, so, by the previous lemma, Y' is dominated by Y. So $Z \in B$. Let us now suppose $Z \in \pi B$. From $Z^m = f$ in B, it follows that $f \in \pi^m B$. Applying m-times 4.1.4 we have $f \in \pi^m A$, which is a contradiction. So $Z \notin \pi B$. Since Y_k is reduced, then $Z^m = f \notin \pi B$. In particular, $f \notin \pi A$. And since $f \in A_K^*$ there exists $g \in A \setminus \pi A$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f \frac{g}{\pi^l} = 1$. So $fg = \pi^l$. But X_k is integral. Then $l = 0$, which implies $f \in A^*$.

Now by the Kummer theory, we associate to any μ_m-torsor over X_K a line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ over X_K such that $\mathcal{L}^m \simeq \mathcal{O}_{X_K}$. Since ${}_mPic(X) = {}_mPic(X_K)$ we can assume that $\mathcal{L} \in {}_mPic(X)$. Then let $\{U_i = \mathrm{Spec}(A_i)\}$ an affine covering of X such that $\mathcal{L}_{|U_i}$ is trivial. If $\{g_{ij}\} \in H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X^*)$ represents $\mathcal{L}$, we have that there exists $f_i \in H^0(U_{i,K}, \mathcal{O}^*_{U_{i,K}})$ such that $(Y_K)_{U_i} = \mathrm{Spec}(A_{i,K}[T_i]/(T_i^m - f_i))$ and $g_{ij}^m = \frac{f_i}{f_j}$. As seen before for any $U_i = \mathrm{Spec}(A_i)$ we can suppose $f_i \in A_i^*$. So $\{Y_i' = \mathrm{Spec}(A_i[T_i]/(T_i^m - f_i))\}$ is a μ_m-torsor which extends the $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$-torsor $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$. The uniqueness comes from 3.0.1. □

Remark 4.2.6. We remark that Y does not usually coincide with Y'. This means that Y' is possibly not normal.

Remark 4.2.7. From the first part of the proof also follows that if $X = \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ is affine, then the proposition remains true if we remove the hypothesis ${}_mPic(X) = {}_mPic(X_K)$ and we consider only μ_m-torsors of the type $A_K[T]/(T^m - f)$ with $f \in A_K^*$.

Corollary 4.2.8. *Let G be an abelian group of order m and let us suppose that R contains a primitive m-th root of unity. Let X be a normal faithfully flat scheme over R with integral fibers and ${}_mPic(X) = {}_mPic(X_K)$. Let us consider a connected G-torsor $f_K : Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ and let Y be the normalization of X in Y_K. Moreover, we assume that Y_k is reduced. Then there exists a (commutative) R-group-scheme G' and a G'-torsor $Y' \longrightarrow X$ over R which extends f_K.*

Proof. By the classification of abelian groups, we have that $G = \mathbb{Z}/m_1\mathbb{Z} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}/m_r\mathbb{Z}$ for some $m_1, \ldots, m_r \in \mathbb{N}$. We remark that R contains a primitive m_i-th root of unity for $i = 1, \ldots, r$. So $(\mathbb{Z}/m_i\mathbb{Z})_K \simeq (\mu_{m_i})_K$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$. Moreover, from hypothesis it follows, for $i = 1, \ldots, r$, that ${}_{m_i}Pic(X) = {}_{m_i}Pic(X_K)$. We firstly state the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2.9. *Let $G_1, \ldots, G_r$ be flat group schemes over a scheme X. Let $Y_i \longrightarrow X$ be a G_i-torsor for any i. Then $\tilde{Y} = Y_1 \times_X \cdots \times_X Y_r$ is a $G_1 \times \cdots \times G_r$-torsor, with the action induced by those of G_i.*

Proof. We skip the proof which easily follows by definition of torsor.

□

We now come back to the proof of the corollary. We call $G_i = \mathbb{Z}/m_i\mathbb{Z}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$. Moreover, we call $\tilde{G}_i = G_1 \times \cdots \times \hat{G}_i \times \cdots \times G_r$. Let us define $(Y_i)_K = Y_K/(\tilde{G}_i)$, then $(Y_i)_K \longrightarrow X_K$ is a G_i-torsor. Moreover, $(Y_i)_K$ is integral and normal. For any i, we call σ_i the action of G_i induced by that of G on $(Y_i)_K$. Hence,

$$\sigma_i \times \mathrm{id} : G_i \times_{X_K} (Y_i)_K \longrightarrow (Y_i)_K \times_{X_K} (Y_i)_K$$

is an isomorphism. By the above lemma, we have that $(Y_1)_K \times_{X_K} \cdots \times_{X_K} (Y_r)_K$ is a G-torsor. Moreover, the natural map

$$q : Y_K \longrightarrow (Y_1)_K \times_{X_K} \cdots \times_{X_K} (Y_r)_K$$

preserves the G-actions; therefore it is a morphism of G-torsors. But, as it is well known, any morphism of G-torsors is an isomorphism of schemes; hence, q is an isomorphism.

For $i = 1, \dots, r$, we denote by Y_i the normalization of X in $(Y_i)_K$. Then Y_i is integral and normal for any i. The projection $Y_K \simeq (Y_1)_K \times_K \cdots \times_K (Y_r)_K \longrightarrow (Y_i)_K$ induces, by 4.2.2, an integral morphism $Y \longrightarrow Y_i$. Hence, we have, by 4.1.4, that $(Y_i)_k$ is reduced. So, by 4.2.3, for any $i = 1, \dots, r$, there exists a μ_{m_i}-torsor $Y_i' \longrightarrow X$ which extends $(Y_i)_K \longrightarrow X_K$. Now let us consider $Y' = Y_1' \times_X \cdots \times_X Y_r'$. Using the above lemma again, it follows that Y' is a $\mu_{m_1} \times \cdots \times \mu_{m_r}$-torsor. □

Remark 4.2.10. Let X be an integral scheme faithfully flat over R and x an R-point of X. Let us consider the fundamental group schemes of Gasbarri $\pi(X, x)$ over R (see [7]) and $\pi(X_K, x_K)$. Then Antei, in [5], proved that the natural morphism

$$\varphi : \pi(X_K, x_K) \longrightarrow \pi(X, x)_K$$

is a quotient morphism and that $\ker(\varphi) = 0$ if and only if any G_K-torsor $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ (with a K-section), such that the induced morphism $\pi(X_K, x_K) \longrightarrow G_K$ is a dominant morphism, is weakly extendible to a G-torsor $Y \longrightarrow X$ over R (with an R-section), for some model G of G_K. We stress that in that context you have also to extend the section of Y_K. But if, for instance, X is proper over R hence Y is proper over R and the K-section of Y_K can be always extended.

Remark 4.2.11. If Y_k is not reduced we have an example of a torsor not weakly extendible. For instance, take $X = \mathrm{Spec}(R[Z, 1/Z])$ and $Y_K = \mathrm{Spec}(K[Z, 1/Z][T]/(T^p - \pi Z))$ as $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$-torsor over X_K. It is not too hard to see that $Y = \mathrm{Spec}(R[Z, 1/Z][T]/(T^p - \pi Z))$ is normal (see for example [13, 8.2.26]), so it is the normalization of X in Y_K. Moreover the action of $\mu_p = \mathrm{Spec}(R[S]/(S^p - 1))$ over Y given by $T \longmapsto ST$ is clearly faithful. So μ_p is the effective model. Using 4.1.1 it follows that, if $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ is weakly extendible by a G'-torsor, then there is a model map $\mu_p \longrightarrow G'$. Hence $G' \simeq \mu_p$, because μ_p does not dominate any group scheme except itself. We now claim that there is no μ_p-torsor $Y' \longrightarrow X$ which extends $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$. Since $\mathrm{Pic}(R[Z, 1/Z]) = 0$, we would have, by the Kummer theory, $Y' = \mathrm{Spec}(R[Z, 1/Z][T]/(T^p - f))$, for some $f \in R[Z, 1/Z]^*$ such that there exists $g \in K[Z, 1/Z]^*$ with $fg^p = \pi Z$. But, since $R[Z, 1/Z]$ is factorial and X_k is integral it is easy to see that this not possible. In particular $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ is also not strongly extendible.

We give here a proof of strong extension of torsors under finite abelian groups G with $(|G|, p) = 1$, for some schemes not necessarily regular. For regular schemes refer to the introduction.

Corollary 4.2.12. *Let G be an abelian group of order m with $(m, p) = 1$ and let us suppose that R contains a primitive m-th root of unity. Let X be a normal faithfully flat scheme over R with integral fibers and ${}_m Pic(X_K) = {}_m Pic(X)$. Let $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ be a connected G-torsor and let Y be the normalization of X in Y_K. Moreover we assume that Y_k is reduced. Then $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ is strongly extendible.*

Proof. Indeed, by 4.2.3, there exists a commutative finite flat R-group scheme G' and a G'-torsor $Y' \longrightarrow X$ which extends $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$. Since the order of G' is coprime with p, then G' is étale. So $Y' \longrightarrow X$ is étale. Since X is normal, it follows from [2, I 9.10] that Y' is normal. Hence, from 4.2.2, $Y' = Y$ and the proof is complete. □

We now conclude the section proving a lemma which will be essential in the sections that follow.

Let us consider a normal faithfully flat R-scheme $X = \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ with integral fibers. And we suppose that $\pi \in \mathcal{R}_A$, where $\mathcal{R}_A$ is the Jacobson radical. This condition means that the closed points of X are in the special fiber. Moreover, it is equivalent to say that, for any $\lambda \in R \setminus R^*$, any lifting of $a \in (A/\lambda A)^*$ is invertible in A. In particular, $A^* \longrightarrow (A/\lambda A)^*$ is surjective. From (4) it follows that $H^1(X, \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}) \subseteq H^1(X, \mathbb{G}_m)$. Then applying the snake lemma to the following diagram (see (7))

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}(A) \arrow[r, "(\psi_{\lambda,n})_*"] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda^{p^n})}(A) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & H^1(X, G_{\lambda,n}) \arrow[r, "i_*"] \arrow[d] & H^1(X, \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & H^1(X, \mathcal{G}^{(\lambda^{p^n})}) \arrow[d] \\
A^* \arrow[r, "p^n"] & A^* \arrow[r] & H^1(X, \mu_{p^n}) \arrow[r, "i_*"] & H^1(X, \mathbb{G}_m) \arrow[r] & H^1(X, \mathbb{G}_m)
\end{tikzcd} \tag{18}$$

we have that the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda^{p^n})}(A)/(\psi_{\lambda,n})_*(\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}(A)) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\alpha^{\lambda^{p^n}}(A)"] & H^1(X, G_{\lambda,n}) \arrow[d] \\
A^*/(A^*)^{p^n} \arrow[r] & H^1(X, \mu_{p^n}).
\end{tikzcd}$$

is cartesian with $\alpha^{\lambda^{p^n}}(A)$ injective.

Remark 4.2.13. Explicitly the injection $\alpha^{\lambda^{p^n}}(A)$ means that, for any $x \in A^*$, $x^{p^n} \equiv 1 \mod \lambda^{p^n}$ if and only if $x \equiv 1 \mod \lambda$.

Lemma 4.2.14. *Let X be as above and let us suppose that R contains a primitive p^n-th root of unity. Let $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ be a μ_{p^n}-torsor with $Y_K = \operatorname{Spec}(A_K[T]/(T^{p^n} - f))$, $f \in A^*$. Let us denote by $Y = \operatorname{Spec}(B)$ the normalization of X in Y_K. We moreover suppose that Y_k is reduced. Then, from 4.2.3 and 4.2.7, there exists a μ_{p^n}-torsor $Y' \longrightarrow X$ which weakly extends $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$.*

- i) *Using the filtration of 3.0.3, $[Y'] \in H^1(X, G_{\pi^j,n})$ if and only if there exists $g \in A^*$ such that $fg^{p^n} = 1 + \pi^{jp^n} f_0$ for some $f_0 \in A$.*
- ii) *Let us suppose moreover $j < v(\lambda_{(n)})$. If $[Y'] \in H^1(X, G_{\pi^j,n}) \setminus H^1(X, G_{\pi^{j+1},n})$ and $fg^{p^n} = 1 + \pi^{jp^n} f_0$, for some $f_0 \in A$ and $g \in A^*$, then f_0 is not a p^n-th power* $\mod \pi$.

Proof. We first prove (i). We observe that $[Y'] \in H^1(X, \mu_{p^n})$ is represented by $f \in A^*/A^{*p^n}$. Since the above commutative diagram is cartesian, then $[Y'] \in H^1(X, G_{\pi^j,n})$ if and only if $f \in \alpha^{\lambda^{p^n}}(A)$. And by definition, $f \in \alpha^{\lambda^{p^n}}(A)$ if and only if there exists $g \in A^*$ such that $fg^{p^n} = 1 + \pi^{jp^n} f_0$ for some $f_0 \in A$.We now prove the second statement. Let us suppose that $[Y'] \in H^1(X, G_{\pi^j,n}) \setminus H^1(X, G_{\lambda_{(n)},n})$. We take any $g \in A^*$ such that $fg^{p^n} = 1 + \pi^{jp^n} f_0$, for some $f_0 \in A$. If $[Y'] \notin H^1(X, G_{\pi^{j+1},n})$, then, by (i), $f_0 \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi^{p^n}$. In fact we will prove $f_0 \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi$ in A. Since the torsor $Y_1 = \operatorname{Spec}(A[T]/(\frac{(1+\pi^j T)^{p^n} - 1}{\pi^{jp^n}} - f_0))$, associated with $[Y'] \in H^1(X, G_{\pi^j,n})$, is integral over X and its generic fiber is isomorphic to Y_K, then, by 4.2.2, the morphism $Y \longrightarrow X$ factors through Y_1. Moreover, $Y \longrightarrow Y_1$ is a dominant morphism between integral affine schemes; hence $T \in B \setminus \{0\}$. The fact that $f_0 \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi^{p^n} A$ implies $T \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi B$. Otherwise, if $T = \pi T_0$ for some $T_0 \in B$, then $T^{p^n} \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{p^n} B$. And, since $j + 1 \le v(\lambda_{(n)})$, we have

$$f_0 = \frac{(1 + \pi^{j+1} T_0)^{p^n} - 1}{\pi^{jp^n}} \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{p^n} B.$$

So, by 4.1.4, $f_0 \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{p^n} A$ against the assumptions. Therefore, $T \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi B$. Now if $f_0 \equiv 0 \mod \pi A$, then, since $j < v(\lambda_{(n)})$, $T^{p^n} \equiv 0 \mod \pi B$. But, as we just proved, $T \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi B$, which contradicts the fact that Y_k is reduced. So $f_0 \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi A$. We finally prove that f_0 is not a p^n-th power $\mod \pi$. Indeed, if $f_0 \equiv g_0^{p^n} \mod \pi$ for some $g_0 \in A \setminus \pi A$ then $f \equiv (1 + \pi^j g_0)^{p^n} \mod \pi^{jp^n+1}$. But $1 + \pi^j g_0$ is invertible $\mod \pi$ then, since $\pi \in \mathcal{R}_A$, $1 + \pi^j g_0$

is invertible. Multiplying f by $(1+\pi^j g_0)^{-p^n}$, we can suppose $f \equiv 1 \mod \pi^{jp^n+1}$, which implies, by what we have just proved, that $f \equiv 1 \mod \pi^{(j+1)p^n}$. Hence, by $i)$, $[Y'] \in H^1(X, G_{\pi^{j+1},n})$; this contradicts the hypothesis of maximality of j. □

5. Strong extension of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$-torsors

Let us suppose that R contains a primitive p-th root of unity. We now suppose that $X = \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ is a normal faithfully flat R-scheme with integral fibers such that $\pi \in \mathcal{R}_A$, where $\mathcal{R}_A$ is the Jacobson radical of A, and ${}_pPic(X_K) = 0$ (e.g. A a local regular faithfully flat R-algebra with integral fibers or A a factorial faithfully flat R-algebra complete with respect to the π-adic topology and with integral fibers). We recall we suppose from the beginning that X noœtherian. Let us consider a nontrivial $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$-torsor

$$Y_K \longrightarrow X_K.$$

Let Y be the normalization of X in Y_K. We suppose that Y_k is reduced. There exists, by 4.2.3, a unique μ_p-torsor $Y' \longrightarrow X$ such that $Y'_K \longrightarrow X_K$ is isomorphic to the $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$-torsor $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$. So $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ defines uniquely an element $[Y'] \in H^1(X, \mu_p)$.

Theorem 5.0.1. *Notation as above. Let us consider the filtration of 3.0.3. If* $[Y_K] \in H^1(X, G_{\pi^\gamma,1}) \setminus H^1(X, G_{\pi^{\gamma+1},1})$*, for some* $0 \le \gamma \le v(\lambda_{(1)})$*, then* Y *is a* $G_{\pi^\gamma,1}$*-torsor. In particular* Y_k *is integral if* $\gamma < v(\lambda_{(1)})$*. Moreover the valuation of the different of the extension* $\mathcal{O}_{Y,\eta}/\mathcal{O}_{X,(\pi)}$ *is* $(p-1)(v(\lambda_{(1)})-\gamma)$*, for the generic point* η *of any irreducible component of* Y_k*.*

Remark 5.0.2. The trivial $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$-torsor over X_K is strongly extendible by the trivial $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$-torsor over X.

Proof. Since ${}_pPic(A_K) = 0$, from the bottom line of (18) with $v(\lambda) = 0$, it follows that $Y_K = \mathrm{Spec}(A_K[T]/(T^p - f))$ with $f \in A_K^*$. From 4.2.7, we can suppose $f \in A^*$. Moreover, $Y' = \mathrm{Spec}(A[T]/(T^p - f))$ is the μ_p-torsor which extends Y_K.

If $\gamma = 0$, then f is not a p-power $\mod \pi$ (otherwise, by 4.2.14, up to a multiplication by a p-th power, we can suppose $f \equiv 1 \mod \pi$ and so $\gamma > 0$). So Y' is normal by 4.1.5. Since Y' is integral over X and its generic fiber is isomorphic to Y_K then, from 4.2.2, we have $Y \simeq Y'$.

If $\gamma = v(\lambda_{(1)})$, then it is an étale torsor and the proof is complete.

If $v(\lambda_{(1)}) > \gamma > 0$ we can suppose, by 4.2.14, $f = 1 + \pi^{p\gamma} f_0$ with $f_0 \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi$ in A. Let us consider the $G_{\pi^\gamma,1}$-torsor

$$Y_1 = \mathrm{Spec}(A[T]/(\frac{(1+\pi^\gamma T)^p - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma}} - f_0)).$$

By 4.2.14 , $f_0 \not\equiv g_0^p \mod \pi$ for any $g_0 \in A \setminus \pi A$. So $(Y_1)_k$ is reduced and, by 4.1.5, Y_1 is normal. Hence again from 4.2.2, we can conclude that $Y_1 \simeq Y$. If $\gamma < v(\lambda_{(1)})$, then $\mathcal{G}_k$ is radicial and $Y_k \longrightarrow X_k$ is an inseparable morphism. Therefore, since X_k is irreducible, Y_k is also irreducible.

The statement about the valuation of the different is clear.

□

Remark 5.0.3. The theorem remains true if we remove the hypothesis ${}_pPic(A_K) = 0$ and we suppose that $Y_K = \mathrm{Spec}(A_K[T]/(T^p - f))$ with $f \in A_K^*$. Indeed ${}_pPic(A_K) = 0$ only needs to ensure that any μ_p-torsor of X_K is of the form $Y_K = \mathrm{Spec}(A_K[T]/(T^p - f))$ with $f \in A_K^*$.

The following corollary will not used for the rest of the paper.

Corollary 5.0.4. *Let* G *be an abelian group of order* m *and let us suppose that* R *contains a primitive* m*-th root of unity. Let* $X = \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ *be a normal faithfully flat* R*-scheme with integral fibers such that* $\pi \in \mathcal{R}_A$ *and* ${}_mPic(X_K) = 0$*. Let* $h_K : Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ *be a connected* G*-torsor with* G *an abelian group. Let* Y *be the normalization of* X *in* Y_K *and let us assume that* Y_k *is integral then* $h : Y \longrightarrow X$ *is faithfully flat.*

Proof. Since G is abelian then $G \simeq \mathbb{Z}/m_1\mathbb{Z} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}/m_r\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/p^{m_{r+1}}\mathbb{Z} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}/p^{m_s}\mathbb{Z}$, with $(m_i, p) = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$. We remark that any cyclic group is isomorphic, over K, to μ_l for some l. So, as above, since ${}_m Pic(X_K) = 0$, we conclude that

$$Y_K = \mathrm{Spec}(A_K[T_1, \dots, T_s]/(T_1^{m_1} - f_1, \dots, T_r^{m_r} - f_r, T_{r+1}^{p^{m_{r+1}}} - f_{r+1}, \dots, T_s^{p^{m_s}} - f_s))$$

with $f_i \in A_K^*$. Let $n = r + m_{r+1} + \cdots + m_s$. We have a factorization

$$h_K : (Y_n)_K := Y_K \xrightarrow{(h_n)_K} (Y_{n-1})_K \xrightarrow{(h_{n-1})_K} \dots \longrightarrow (Y_1)_K \xrightarrow{(h_1)_K} X_K =: (Y_0)_K$$

with $(h_i)_K$ a $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$-torsor, if $i = 1, \dots, n-r$ and $(h_i)_K$ is a $\mathbb{Z}/m_{n-i+1}\mathbb{Z}$-torsor if $i = n-r+1, \dots, n$. Any $(Y_i)_K$ is normal integral and affine. So if $(Y_{i-1})_K = \mathrm{Spec}((B_{i-1})_K)$, it is easy to show that $(Y_i)_K = \mathrm{Spec}((B_{i-1})_K[T]/(T^p - f))$ with $f \in (B_{i-1})_K^*$, if $i = 1, \dots, n-r$ or $(Y_i)_K = \mathrm{Spec}((B_{i-1})_K[T]/(T^{m_{n-i+1}} - f))$ with $f \in (B_{i-1})_K^*$, if $i = n-r+1, \dots, n$. We observe that not necessarily $Pic((Y_i)_K) = 0$. Let $Y_i = \mathrm{Spec}(B_i)$ be the normalization of X in $(Y_i)_K$. We also obtain that Y_i is the normalization of Y_{i-i} in $(Y_i)_K$. We have a factorization

$$h : Y \xrightarrow{h_n} Y_{n-1} \xrightarrow{h_{n-1}} \dots \longrightarrow Y_1 \xrightarrow{h_1} X.$$

Since Y_k is integral, then $(Y_i)_k$ is integral for any i (see 4.1.4). Moreover h_i is finite, in particular it is closed. So if $\pi \in \mathcal{R}_A$ then $\pi \in \mathcal{R}_{B_i}$ also for any i. From the above theorem, 5.0.3, 4.2.12 and 4.2.7 we have, for any i, that $Y_i \longrightarrow Y_{i-1}$ is a torsor under some finite flat group scheme. In particular h_i is faithfully flat for any i. Therefore, h is faithfully flat.

□

6. Strong extension of $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsors

6.1. **Setup and degeneration types.** Now we suppose that R contains a primitive p^2-th root of unity. Therefore we have $(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})_K \simeq (\mu_{p^2})_K$. We moreover suppose $p > 2$. Let $X := \mathrm{Spec}\, A$ be a normal essentially semireflexive scheme over R (see §1) with integral fibers such that $\pi \in \mathcal{R}_A$. We also assume ${}_{p^2}Pic(X_K) = 0$. Let $h_K : Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ be a connected $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsor. Then we consider the factorization

$$Y_K \xrightarrow{(h_2)_K} (Y_1)_K \xrightarrow{(h_1)_K} X_K$$

with both $(h_1)_K, (h_2)_K$ nontrivial $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$-torsors. Let $Y_1 = \mathrm{Spec}(B_1)$ be the normalization of X in $(Y_1)_K$ and $Y = \mathrm{Spec}(B)$ the normalization of X in Y_K. We suppose that Y_k is integral. Since X is normal, by 4.2.2, it follows that Y is normal and that Y is the integral closure of Y_1 in Y_K. So we have the factorization

$$h : Y \xrightarrow{h_2} Y_1 \xrightarrow{h_1} X$$

with h_1 and h_2 degree p morphisms. Again by 4.2.2, it follows that Y_1 is normal. By 4.1.4, we have that, since Y_k is integral, then $(Y_1)_k$ is integral too.

Since ${}_{p^2}Pic(A_K) = 0$, we can suppose $Y_K = \mathrm{Spec}(A_K[T]/(T^{p^2} - f))$ for some $f \in A_K^* \setminus (A_K^*)^{p^2}$. By 4.2.3, we can suppose $f \in A^*$. We can also write

$$Y_K = \mathrm{Spec}(A[T_1, T_2]/(T_1^p - f, \frac{T_2^p}{T_1} - 1)).$$

Therefore, we have

$$(Y_1)_K = \mathrm{Spec}(A_K[T_1]/(T_1^p - f))$$

and

$$Y_K = \mathrm{Spec}((B_1)_K[T_2]/(\frac{T_2^p}{T_1} - 1)). \tag{19}$$

We remark that B_K is finite and free as an A_K-module. In particular it is semireflexive over A_K. From 1.0.13 it follows that Y is an essentially semireflexive scheme over $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$. Therefore we can apply 1.0.17 to check if a group scheme is an effective model for the $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-action on Y.

We now want to attach to the cover $Y_K \to X_K$ four invariants. We have seen in the previous section that there exists an invariant, which we called γ, that is sufficient to solve the problem of strong extension of $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})_K$-torsors. So the first two invariants are simply the invariants γ which arise from the two $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})_K$-torsors $Y_K \longrightarrow (Y_1)_K$ and $(Y_1)_K \longrightarrow X_K$. In precise by the above discussion it follows that h_1 satisfies hypothesis of §5, hence we can apply 5.0.1. Then, if we define $\gamma_1 \leq v(\lambda_{(1)})$ such that

$$[(Y_1)_K] \in H^1(X, G_{\pi^{\gamma_1},1}) \setminus H^1(X, G_{\pi^{\gamma_1+1},1}),$$

it follows that $Y_1 \longrightarrow X$ is a $G_{\pi^{\gamma_1},1}$-torsor. From 5.0.1, we have that γ_1 is also determined by the valuation of the different $\mathcal{D}(h_1)$ of $h_1 : \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{Y_1,(\pi)}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{X,(\pi)})$. We indeed have

$$v(\mathcal{D}(h_1)) = v(p) - (p-1)\gamma_1.$$

From 5.0.1, we have that $(Y_1)_k$ is integral. Moreover, since h_1 is a closed morphism, then $\pi \in \mathcal{R}_{B_1}$. But not necessarily ${}_pPic((Y_1)_K) = 0$. However, from (19) and the remark 5.0.3 we can also apply 5.0.1 to the morphism $h_2 : Y \longrightarrow Y_1$. Then, if we define $\gamma_2 \leq v(\lambda_{(1)})$ such that

$$[(Y)_K] \in H^1(Y_1, G_{\pi^{\gamma_2},1}) \setminus H^1(Y_1, G_{\pi^{\gamma_2+1},1}),$$

it follows that $Y \longrightarrow Y_1$ is a $G_{\pi^{\gamma_2},1}$-torsor. The invariant γ_2 is determined by the different of $h_2 : \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{Y,(\pi)}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{Y_1,(\pi)})$, too. Indeed

$$v(\mathcal{D}(h_2)) = v(p) - (p-1)\gamma_2.$$

The third invariant is linked to the filtration of 3.0.3. It is the integer $j \leq v(\lambda_{(2)})$ such that $[Y_K] \in H^1(X, G_{\pi^j,2}) \setminus H^1(X, G_{\pi^{j+1},2})$. We observe that there exists a $G_{\pi^j,2}$-torsor Y'' which extends $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$. By 4.2.2, we have morphisms $Y \longrightarrow Y''$ and $Y_1 \longrightarrow Y''/G_{\pi^j,1}$ such that the following diagram commutes

(20)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
Y \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y'' \arrow[d] \\
Y_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[dr] & Y''/G_{\pi^j,1} \arrow[d] \\
& X
\end{tikzcd}$$

Lemma 6.1.1. *We have the following relations.*

i) $pj \leq \gamma_1 \leq v(\lambda_{(1)})$,
ii) $j \leq \gamma_2 \leq v(\lambda_{(1)})$,

Proof. By definition of γ_i, for $i = 1, 2$, we have $\gamma_i \leq v(\lambda_{(1)})$. We now prove the remaining statements. Let us consider the diagram (20).

i) We recall that $Y_1 \longrightarrow X$ is a $G_{\pi^{\gamma_1},1}$-torsor and $Y''/G_{\pi^j,1} \longrightarrow X$ is a $G_{\pi^{pj},1}$-torsor. So, by 4.1.1, we have a morphism $G_{\pi^{\gamma_1},1} \longrightarrow G_{\pi^{pj},1}$. Therefore $\gamma_1 \geq pj$.
ii) We recall that $Y \longrightarrow Y_1$ is a $G_{\pi^{\gamma_2},1}$-torsor and $Y'' \longrightarrow Y''/G_{\pi^j,1}$ is a $G_{\pi^j,1}$-torsor. Again by 4.1.1, we have a morphism $G_{\pi^{\gamma_2},1} \longrightarrow G_{\pi^j,1}$. Therefore, $\gamma_2 \geq j$.

□

By definition of j, up to a multiplication of f by an element of $(A^*)^{p^2}$, which does not change the μ_{p^2}-torsor on the generic fiber, we can suppose $f = 1+\pi^{p^2 j} f_0$ with $f_0 \in A$. And, if $j < v(\lambda_{(2)})$, by 4.2.14 f_0 is not a p^2-th power $\mod \pi$.

Before introducing the last invariant, we describe explicitly the scheme Y. By definition of γ_1 and by the proof of 5.0.1, there exists $g \in A^*$ (not unique) such that $fg^{-p} = 1 + \pi^{p\gamma_1} f_1$ with $f_1 \in A$. Let us consider $\mathrm{Spec}(B_1)$ with

$$B_1 = A[T_1]/(\frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1)^p - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_1}} - f_1).$$

If $\gamma_1 = v(\lambda_{(1)})$ then $\mathrm{Spec}(B_1) \longrightarrow X$ is étale, then $\mathrm{Spec}(B_1)$ is normal and hence, by 4.2.2, $Y_1 = \mathrm{Spec}(B_1)$. While if $\gamma_1 < v(\lambda_{(1)})$, by 4.2.14, f_1 is not a p-th power $\mod \pi$. Then, by 4.1.5, $\mathrm{Spec}(B_1)$ is normal and hence again $Y = \mathrm{Spec}(B_1)$.

If $Y_1' \longrightarrow Y_1$ is the μ_p-torsor which extends $Y_K \longrightarrow (Y_1)_K$, then Y is the normalization of Y_1 in

$$(Y_1')_K = \mathrm{Spec}((B_1)_K[T_2]/(\frac{T_2^p}{1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1} - g)).$$

Then, reasoning as above, there exists $H(T_1) \in B_1^*$, such that

$$g(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1)(H(T_1))^{-p} \equiv 1 \mod \pi^{p\gamma_2}B_1,$$

and $Y = \mathrm{Spec}(B)$ with

$$B = B_1[T_2]/\Big(\frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_2}T_2)^p - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_2}} - \frac{gH(T_1)^{-p}(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1) - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_2}}\Big).$$

We remark that the definition of g and $H(T_1)$ depends on the choice of the representative f of $[Y_K] \in H^1(X, \mu_{p^2})$ and they are not uniquely determined. We now see how they vary as f varies. We stress that we require $f \equiv 1 \mod \pi^{p^2 j}$. Let us substitute $a^{p^2} f$ to f, with $a \in A^*$ and $a^{p^2} f \equiv 1 \mod \pi^{p^2 j}$. It follows from 4.2.13 that $a^{p^2} f \equiv 1 \mod \pi^{p^2 j}$ is equivalent to $a \equiv 1 \mod \pi^j$. Now it is immediate to see that we have to substitute $a^p g$ to g and $aH(T_1)$ to $H(T_1)$. We now prove that, for a fixed f, the elements g and $H(T_1)$ are uniquely determined in a certain sense.

Lemma 6.1.2. *Notation as above. Let us fix a representative* $f = 1 + \pi^{p^2 j} f_0$ *of* $[Y_K] \in H^1(X, \mu_{p^2})$. *We have the following results.*

(1) *The element g is uniquely determined* $\mod \pi^{\gamma_1}$. *Moreover, we can suppose*

$$g = 1 + \pi^{jp} g_0 \text{ with } g_0 \notin \pi A.$$

(2) *The element $H(T_1)$ is uniquely determined* $\mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$. *Any $H(T_1)$ as above is of the form*

$$H(T_1) = 1 + \pi^j H_1(T_1) \text{ with } H_1(T_1) \notin \pi B_1.$$

if $0 \le j < \gamma_2$, and we can suppose $H(T_1) = 1$ if $j = \gamma_2$. Finally, if $j > 0$, up to a change of the representative f, we can suppose $H(0) = 1$.

Proof. (1) We firstly prove the uniqueness of $g \mod \pi^{\gamma_1}$. By definition of g we have $g^p \equiv f \mod \pi^{p\gamma_1}$. Let us take $g' \in A^*$. Then $g'^p \equiv g^p \equiv f \mod \pi^{p\gamma_1}$ if and only if

$$(\frac{g}{g'})^p \equiv 1 \mod \pi^{p\gamma_1}$$

if and only if, from 4.2.13,

$$g \equiv g' \mod \pi^{\gamma_1}.$$

This proves the uniqueness of $g \mod \pi^{\gamma_1}$. In fact we proved something more. Indeed, since g is determined by the property $g^p \equiv f \mod \pi^{\pi^{p\gamma_1}}$, we have also proved that we can replace g with any $g' \in A^*$ such that $g' \equiv g \mod \pi^{\gamma_1}$. (Clearly, $H(T_1)$ will also be different).

We now prove that, up to a change of g by $g(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}h)$ with $h \in A$, we can suppose

$$g = 1 + \pi^{jp} g_0 \text{ with } g_0 \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi A.$$

Since $f = 1 + \pi^{p^2 j} f_0$ and $pj \leq \gamma_1$ (see 6.1.1), we have

$$g^p \equiv 1 \mod \pi^{p^2 j}.$$

Again by 4.2.13, we obtain

$$g = 1 + \pi^{pj} g_0$$

for some $g_0 \in A$. If $pj < \gamma_1$ then $g_0 \notin \pi A$, otherwise, since $g^p \equiv 1 + \pi^{p^2 j} f_0 \mod \pi^{p\gamma_1}$, we would have, again by 4.2.13, $f_0 \equiv 0 \mod \pi$, against hypothesis on f_0. While, if $pj = \gamma_1$ and $g_0 \equiv 0 \mod \pi$, by what proved before, we can replace g with $g' = g(1 + \pi^{pj} h)$, with $h \notin \pi A$. So $g' = 1 + \pi^{pj}(g_0 + h + \pi^{pj} g_0 h)$ with $g_0 + h + \pi^{pj} g_0 h \equiv h \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi$.

(2) As above, we can prove that $H(T_1)$ is unique $\mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$ and that we can replace it with any $\tilde{H}(T_1)$ such that $\tilde{H}(T_1) \equiv H(T_1) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$. And since $g \equiv 1 \mod \pi^{pj} B_1$ and $\gamma_1 \geq pj$ (see 6.1.1) then, $H(T_1)^p \equiv 1 \mod \pi^{jp} B_1$. Hence, as above, we can conclude $H(T_1) = 1 + \pi^j H_1(T_1)$. We now prove that $H_1(T_1) \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi B_1$ if $j < \gamma_2$ and that we can assume $H(T_1) = 1$ if $j = \gamma_2$. If $j < \gamma_2$, then from

$$(1 + \pi^j H_1(T_1))^p \equiv (1 + \pi^{pj} g_0)(1 + \pi^{\gamma_1} T_1) \mod \pi^{p\gamma_2}$$

it follows that, if $H_1(T_1) \equiv 0 \mod \pi B_1$, then, using 4.2.13, we have $g_0 + \pi^{\gamma_1 - pj} T_1 \equiv 0 \mod \pi B_1$. Since B_1 is finite and free over R it follows that $g_0 \equiv 0 \mod \pi$, against what just proved in 1. Now if $\gamma_2 = j$ then we can take $H(T_1) = 1$ which clearly satisfies the condition

$$H(T_1)^p \equiv (1 + \pi^{pj} g_0)(1 + \pi^{\gamma_1} T_1) \mod \pi^{p\gamma_2}.$$

We now prove the last statement. Let $j > 0$. From what we just proved we know that $H(0) \equiv 1 \mod \pi^j A$. Since $\pi \in \mathcal{R}_A$, then $H(0)$ is invertible. If we change f into $fH(0)^{-p^2}$, from the discussion before the lemma, we have to replace $H(T_1)$ with $\frac{H(T_1)}{H(0)}$. So the proof is complete.

□

Now, given $H(T_1) = \sum_{k=0}^{p-1} a_k {T_1}^k \in B_1^*$, let us consider $H'(T_1)$ as its formal derivative. Using the above lemma, we suppose $a_0 = 1$ if $j > 0$. For any $m \geq \gamma_1$, we will say that $a \in \pi R$ satisfies $(\triangle)_m$ if

$$aH(T_1) \equiv \pi^{m - \gamma_1} H'(T_1) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}.$$

We finally give the definition of the fourth invariant.

Definition 6.1.3. We will call *effective threshold* the number

$$\kappa = \min\{m \geq \gamma_1 | \exists a \in \pi R \text{ which satisfies } (\triangle)_m\}.$$

If we take $m \geq \gamma_1 + \gamma_2$ and $a = 0$, we see that such a minimum exists.

Lemma 6.1.4. *For any $m \geq \kappa$ there exists a unique solution, $\mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$, of $(\triangle)_m$. We will call $\alpha_m \in \pi R$ any of its lifting. If $H(0) = a_0 \equiv 0 \mod \pi A$ then $\alpha_m \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$.*

Remark 6.1.5. By 6.1.2 it follows that the case $H(0) \equiv 0 \mod \pi$ can happen only if $j = 0$.

Proof. Let us firstly suppose $a_0 \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi A$. If b_i, for $i = 1, 2$, is solution of $(\triangle)_m$, it follows that for any $m \geq \gamma_1$ we have in particular $b_i a_0 \equiv \pi^{m - \gamma_1} a_1 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$. Therefore

$$a_0(b_1 - b_2) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}.$$

But $a_0 \notin \pi A$, X is flat over R and X_k is integral; therefore $b_1 \equiv b_2 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$.

We now consider the case $a_0 \in \pi A$. Since $H(T) \in B_1^*$ and $a_0 \in \pi A$, then there exists $0 < i \leq p - 1$ such that $a_i \notin \pi A$. Let $\bar{i}$ be the least integer with this property. Let a be a solution solution of $(\triangle)_m$ and suppose that $a \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$. In particular

$$a a_{\bar{i}} \equiv (\bar{i} + 1) a_{\bar{i}+1} \pi^{m - \gamma_1} \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$$

and

$$aa_{\bar{i}-1} \equiv \bar{i} a_{\bar{i}} \pi^{m-\gamma_1} \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}.$$

Therefore, by the minimality of $\bar{i}$ and by the fact that $a \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$,

$$v(a) \geq m - \gamma_1 > v(a)$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, if $a_0 \in \pi A$, then $a \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$. □

Definition 6.1.6. Using the previous notation, we say that the degeneration type of $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ is $(j, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \kappa)$.

Lemma 6.1.7. *We have $\gamma_1 \leq \kappa \leq \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - j$. In particular $\gamma_2 = j$ implies $\kappa = \gamma_1$.*

Proof. By 6.1.2, $H'(T) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^j$. Therefore, if we take $m = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - j$, then

$$\pi^{m-\gamma_1} H'(T) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}.$$

Therefore, $a = 0$ satisfies $(\triangle)_m$. This implies $\kappa \leq \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - j$. Now, if $\gamma_2 = j$, then $\kappa \leq \gamma_1$. But, by definition of κ, we have $\kappa \geq \gamma_1$. Hence $\kappa = \gamma_1$. □

6.2. **The main theorem.** We here prove the main theorem of the paper.

Theorem 6.2.1. *Let us suppose that R contains a primitive p^2-th root of unity and that $p > 2$. Let $X := \operatorname{Spec} A$ be a normal essentially semireflexive scheme over R with integral fibers such that $\pi \in \mathcal{R}_A$. We moreover assume ${}_{p^2}Pic(X_K) = 0$. Let $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ be a connected $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsor and Y be the normalization of X in Y_K. Let us suppose that Y_k is integral. If Y_K has $(j, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \kappa)$ as degeneration type, then its effective model is*

$$\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\kappa}, \pi^{\gamma_2}; E_p(\alpha_\kappa S), 1)}.$$

Moreover, if $\alpha_\kappa \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$, then $v(\alpha_\kappa) = \kappa - \gamma_1 + j$. Otherwise $\kappa - \gamma_1 + j = \gamma_2$.

Proof. As we proved in the previous subsection $Y = \operatorname{Spec}(B)$ with

$$B = A[T_1, T_2] / \left(\frac{(1 + \pi^{\gamma_1} T_1)^p - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_1}} - f_1, \frac{(1 + \pi^{\gamma_2} T_2)^p - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_2}} - \frac{g H(T_1)^{-p} (1 + \pi^{\gamma_1} T_1) - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_2}} \right).$$

By the definition of integral closure of X in Y_K, the $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-action on Y_K can be extended to an action on Y. We now explicitly describe this action. If we set

$$\eta_\pi = \frac{\pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)})}}{\lambda_{(1)}} \eta = \frac{\pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)})}}{\lambda_{(1)}} \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \frac{(-1)^{k-1}}{k} \lambda_{(2)}^k$$

then we can write, by 2.2.6 and 2.2.13,

$$\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z} = \operatorname{Spec}(A[S_1, S_2] / \left(\frac{(1 + \pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)})} S_1)^p - 1}{\pi^{pv(\lambda_{(1)})}}, \frac{\frac{(E_p(\eta_\pi S_1) + \pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)})} S_2)^p}{1 + \pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)})} S_1} - 1}{\pi^{pv(\lambda_{(1)})}} \right)). \tag{21}$$

Since Y_K is a μ_{p^2}- torsor, on the generic fiber, the action is given by

$$1 + \pi^{\gamma_1} T_1 \longmapsto (1 + \pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)})} S_1)(1 + \pi^{\gamma_2} T_1)$$
$$(1 + \pi^{\gamma_2} T_2) H(T_1) \longmapsto (E_p(\eta_\pi S_1) + \pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)})} S_2)(1 + \pi^{\gamma_2} T_2) H(T_1),$$

so it is globally given by

$$T_1 \longmapsto \pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)}) - \gamma_1} S_1 + T_1 + \pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)})} S_1 T_1$$
$$T_2 \longmapsto \frac{(E_p(\eta_\pi S_1) + \pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)})} S_2) \left(\frac{(1 + \pi^{\gamma_2} T_2) H(T_1)}{H(\pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)}) - \gamma_1} S_1 + T_1 + \pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)})} S_1 T_1)} \right) - 1}{\pi^{\gamma_2}}$$

The proof of the theorem is obtained as a consequence of several lemmas.

Lemma 6.2.2. *If an effective model $\mathcal{G}$ for the action of $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$ exists, then it is of the form $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^m,\pi^{\gamma_2};F,1)}$ with $v(\lambda_{(1)}) \geq m \geq \max\{\gamma_2, \gamma_1\}$.*

Proof. Since the effective model is in particular a model of $(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})_K$, it follows, by 2.2.11, that the effective model $\mathcal{G}$ is of the form $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^m,\pi^{\gamma_2};F,1)}$ with $v(\lambda_{(1)}) \geq m \geq \gamma_2$. Moreover, $\mathcal{G}/G_{\pi^{\gamma_2},1} \simeq G_{\pi^m,1}$ has an X-action over Y_1. But $Y_1 \longrightarrow X$ is a $G_{\pi^{\gamma_1},1}$-torsor. So, by 4.1.1, we have a model map $G_{\pi^m,1} \longrightarrow G_{\pi^{\gamma_1},1}$. Then $m \geq \gamma_1$. □

Let us now consider a group scheme of type $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^m,\pi^{\gamma_2},F,1)}$. We consider the normalization map $\varphi : \mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^{(\pi^m,\pi^{\gamma_2},F,1)}$. We give necessary and sufficient conditions to have an action of $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^m,\pi^{\gamma_2};F,1)}$ on Y compatible with φ. By 2.2.11, we have that

$$F(S) = E_p(aS) \in ((R/\pi^{\gamma_2}R)[S]/(\frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}S)^p - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_1}}))^*$$

for some $a \in R/\pi^{\gamma_2}R$. In the following, we take a lifting $\tilde{a} \in R$ of $a \in R/\pi^{\gamma_2}R$ and consider $\tilde{F}(S) = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \frac{\tilde{a}^i}{i!} S^i \in R[S]$ as a lifting of $F(S)$.

Lemma 6.2.3. *There exists an action of $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^m,\pi^{\gamma_2};F,1)}$ on Y compatible with φ if and only if*

$$\tilde{F}(S)H(T) - H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S + T + \pi^m ST) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$$

Proof. Let us suppose that such an action exists. Reasoning as above, it is possible to show that the action is given by

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &\longmapsto \pi^{m-\gamma_1}S_1 + T_1 + \pi^m S_1 T_1 \\ T_2 &\longmapsto \frac{(\tilde{F}(S_1) + \pi^{\gamma_2}S_2)\left(\frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_2}T_2)H(T_1)}{H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S_1+T_1+\pi^m S_1T_1)}\right) - 1}{\pi^{\gamma_2}} \end{aligned}$$

Then, in particular, $\frac{(\tilde{F}(S_1)+\pi^{\gamma_2}S_2)\left(\frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_2}T_2)H(T_1)}{H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S_1+T_1+\pi^m S_1T_1)}\right)-1}{\pi^{\gamma_2}}$ belongs to

$$B \otimes A[S_1, S_2]/\left(\frac{(1+\pi^m S_1)^p - 1}{\pi^{mp}}, \frac{\frac{(\tilde{F}(S_1)+\pi^{\gamma_2}S_2)^p}{1+\pi^m S_1} - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_2}}\right)$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{(\tilde{F}(S_1) + \pi^{\gamma_2}S_2)\left(\frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_2}T_2)H(T_1)}{H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S_1+T_1+\pi^m S_1T_1)}\right) - 1}{\pi^{\gamma_2}} = \\ &\frac{\tilde{F}(S_1)H(T_1) - H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S_1 + T_1 + \pi^m S_1T_1)}{\pi^{\gamma_2}H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S_1 + T_1 + \pi^m S_1T_1)} + T_2\frac{\tilde{F}(S_1)H(T_1)}{H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S_1 + T_1 + \pi^m S_1T_1)} + \\ &+ S_2\frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_2}T_2)H(T_1)}{H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S_1 + T_1 + \pi^m S_1T_1)}. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

This implies

$$\tilde{F}(S_1)H(T_1) - H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S_1 + T_1 + \pi^m S_1T_1) \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}.$$

But it is clear that this condition is also sufficient to define the required action. □

The next lemma, together with 6.2.3, links the definition of the effective threshold with the existence of an action of a model of $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$ on Y.

Lemma 6.2.4. *Let $\tilde{b} \in \pi R$. Let us consider $\tilde{G}(S) = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \frac{\tilde{b}^i}{i!} S^i \in R[S]$. The following statements are equivalent.*

(i) $\tilde{G}(S)H(T) \equiv H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S + T + \pi^m ST) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$*;*

(ii) $\tilde{b}H(T) \equiv \pi^{m-\gamma_1}H'(T) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$, *where* H' *is the formal derivative of* H.

Moreover, they imply the following assertions.

(1) *Let us consider* $R[G_{\pi^m,1}] = R[S]/(\frac{(1+\pi^m S)^p-1}{\pi^{mp}})$. *Then*

$$\tilde{G}(S) \in \mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(G_{\pi^m,1_{|S_{\pi^{\gamma_2}}}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_{\pi^{\gamma_2}}})$$

and

$$\tilde{G}(S)^p \equiv 1 + \pi^m S \mod \pi^{p\gamma_2}R[G_{\pi^m,1}].$$

(2) *If* $m > \gamma_1$ *then*

$$\frac{\tilde{G}(S)H(T) - H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S + T + \pi^m ST)}{\pi^{\gamma_2}} \equiv \frac{\tilde{b}H(T) - \pi^{m-\gamma_1}H'(T)}{\pi^{\gamma_2}} \mod \pi$$

Remark 6.2.5. We assume the theorem in this remark. Let us suppose $\tilde{b}H(T) \equiv H'(T) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$. In particular, by definition, $\kappa = \gamma_1$. And from 6.2.1, we also have $\kappa \geq \gamma_2$. We remark that if $j = 0$, then, again from 6.2.1, it follows that $\gamma_2 = j = 0$. So in any case, from 6.1.2(*2*) we can suppose $H(0) = 1$. So if we consider only the constant term, as polynomials in T, of the equality (i), we obtain

$$H(S) \equiv \tilde{G}(S) \equiv \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \frac{\tilde{b}^i}{i!} S^i \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}.$$

Moreover, from 6.2.4(i), it follows that we can think $H(S)$ as an element of $\mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(G_{\mu,1_{|S_\lambda}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_\lambda})$. Then from 2.2.5, it follows that $\tilde{b}^p \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$.

Proof. $(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$. Let us suppose

$$\tilde{G}(S)H(T) \equiv H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S + T + \pi^m ST) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}.$$

We consider both members as polynomials in S with coefficients in $R[T]$. Then, if we compare the coefficients of S, we obtain (ii).

$(i) \Leftarrow (ii)$. Let $H^{(k)}(T)$ denote the k^{th} formal derivative of $H(T)$. We remark that (i) is equivalent to

$$\tilde{b}^k H(T) \equiv (\pi^{m-\gamma_1})^k H^{(k)}(T) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$$

for $1 \leq k \leq p-1$. We prove a little more. We prove that

$$\tilde{b}^k H(T) \equiv (\pi^{m-\gamma_1})^k H^{(k)}(T) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2 + \min\{(k-1)v(\tilde{b}),(k-1)(m-\gamma_1)\}} \tag{23}$$

For $k = 1$ it is obvious. Let us now suppose it is true for k, we prove it for $k+1$. If we multiply (23) by $\tilde{b}$, we obtain

$$\tilde{b}^{k+1} H(T) \equiv \tilde{b}(\pi^{m-\gamma_1})^k H^{(k)}(T) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2 + \min\{(k-1)v(\tilde{b}),(k-1)(m-\gamma_1)\}+v(\tilde{b})}. \tag{24}$$

Moreover, if we differentiate the equation (ii) k times, we obtain

$$\tilde{b}H^{(k)}(T) \equiv \pi^{m-\gamma_1}H^{(k+1)}(T) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}. \tag{25}$$

Multiplying (25) by $\pi^{k(m-\gamma_1)}$, we obtain

$$\tilde{b}\pi^{k(m-\gamma_1)}H^{(k)}(T) \equiv (\pi^{m-\gamma_1})^{(k+1)}H^{(k+1)}(T) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2 + k(m-\gamma_1)}. \tag{26}$$

Then (24) and (26) give

$$\tilde{b}^{k+1}H(T) \equiv (\pi^{m-\gamma_1})^{k+1}H^{(k+1)}(T) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2 + \min\{kv(\tilde{b}),k(m-\gamma_1)\}}.$$

as we required. So (i) and *2* are proved. Let us now suppose (i) true.

1. We recall that $H(T)=\sum_{i=0}^{p-1}a_iT^i\in(A[T]/(\frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T)^p-1}{\pi^{\gamma_1 p}}-f_1))^*=B_1^*$. If $a_0\in\pi A$ then $\tilde{b}\equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$ by 6.1.4. Let us now suppose that $a_0\notin\pi A$. We think $H(S)\in A[S]/(\frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}S)^p-1}{\pi^{\gamma_1 p}})=R[G_{\pi^{\gamma_1},1}]\otimes_R A$. We consider the morphism $\psi_{\pi^m,\pi^{\gamma_1}}:G_{\pi^m,1}\longrightarrow G_{\pi^{\gamma_1},1}$, given by $S\mapsto\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S$. Then

$$\psi^*_{\pi^m,\pi^{\gamma_1}}(H(S))=H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S)$$

However if we compare the coefficients of T in (i) we obtain

$$H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S)\equiv a_0\tilde{G}(S) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}. \tag{27}$$

Therefore,

$$\psi^*_{\pi^m,\pi^{\gamma_1}}(H(S))\equiv a_0\tilde{G}(S) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}.$$

Let us now consider $\mathrm{id}\times\psi_{\pi^m,\pi^{\gamma_1}}:G_{\pi^m,1}\times G_{\pi^m,1}\longrightarrow G_{\pi^m,1}\times G_{\pi^{\gamma_1},1}$. Hence, if we apply $\mathrm{id}\times\psi^*_{\pi^m,\pi^{\gamma_1}}$ to (*i*) we obtain, using (27),

$$a_0\tilde{G}(S)\tilde{G}(T)\equiv H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}(S+T+\pi^mST))\equiv a_0\tilde{G}(S+T+\pi^mST) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$$

which implies, since $a_0\notin\pi A$ and $G_{\pi^m,1}\times G_{\pi^m,1}$ is flat over A,

$$\tilde{G}(S)\tilde{G}(T)\equiv\tilde{G}(S+T+\pi^mST) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}.$$

This means $\tilde{G}(S)\in\mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(G_{\pi^m,1|S_{\pi^{\gamma_2}}},\mathbb{G}_{m|S_{\pi^{\gamma_2}}})$. Moreover, we know that

$$H(T)^p\equiv g(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T) \mod \pi^{p\gamma_2}B_1. \tag{28}$$

Hence,

$$(H(T)\tilde{G}(S))^p\equiv g(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T)\tilde{G}(S)^p \mod \pi^{p\gamma_2}(R[G_{\pi^m,1}]\otimes_R B_1).$$

Moreover, it is easy to see that, since $m\geq\gamma_1$,

$$R[G_{\pi^m,1}]\otimes_R B_1=R[S,T]/\left(\frac{((1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T)(1+\pi^mS))^p-1}{\pi^{p\gamma_1}}-f_1,\frac{(1+\pi^mS)^p-1}{\pi^{mp}}\right).$$

Then we can substitute $\frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T)(1+\pi^mS)-1}{\pi^{\gamma_1}}$ to T in (28) and we obtain

$$(H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S+T+\pi^mST))^p\equiv g(1+\pi^mS)(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T) \mod \pi^{p\gamma_2}(R[G_{\pi^m,1}]\otimes_R B_1).$$

By hypothesis we have that

$$\tilde{G}(S)H(T)\equiv H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S+T+\pi^mST) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}(R[G_{\pi^m,1}]\otimes_R B_1)$$

and therefore, using (28),

$$g(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T)\tilde{G}(S)^p\equiv g(1+\pi^mS)(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T) \mod \pi^{p\gamma_2}(R[G_{\pi^m,1}]\otimes_R B_1).$$

This implies

$$\tilde{G}(S)^p\equiv(1+\pi^mS) \mod \pi^{p\gamma_2}R[G_{\pi^m,1}].$$

□

We are now able to find a candidate to be the effective model.

Lemma 6.2.6. *If an effective model for the $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-action exists, it must be the group scheme $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^\kappa,\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_\kappa S),1)}$. In particular, we must have $\alpha_\kappa\in\Phi^1_{\pi^\kappa,\pi^{\gamma_2}}$. Moreover $\gamma_2\leq\kappa\leq v(\lambda_{(1)})$.*

Proof. Since, as we have seen, $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$ acts on Y then, by 6.2.3 and the previous lemma, it follows that η_π satisfies $(\triangle)_{v(\lambda_{(1)})}$. Therefore, $\kappa\leq v(\lambda_{(1)})$.

By 6.2.2 it follows that the effective model is of the form $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^m,\pi^{\gamma_2};F,1)}$ for some $m\leq v(\lambda_{(1)})$ and $F\in\mathrm{Hom}_{gr}(G_{\pi^m,1|S_{\pi^{\gamma_2}}},\mathbb{G}_{m|S_{\pi^{\gamma_2}}})$. By 6.2.3 and 6.2.4, we have that if a group scheme $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^m,\pi^{\gamma_2};F,1)}$ acts on Y then $F=E_p(\alpha_mS)$ with $\alpha_m\in\pi R$ which satisfies $(\triangle)_m$. Conversely, if $m\leq v(\lambda_{(1)})$ and $\alpha_m\in\pi R$ satisfies $(\triangle)_m$, then by 6.2.3, 6.2.4(*1*) and 2.2.3 we can construct the group scheme $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^m,\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_mS),1)}$ and it acts on Y compatible with the action of $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$. We remark that by 6.1.4 the equation $(\triangle)_m$ has (unique) solution if and only if $m \geq \kappa$. Moreover, for any $v(\lambda_{(1)}) \geq m' \geq m$ there exists a model map $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{m'},\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_{m'}S),1)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{m},\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_{m}S),1)}$. Indeed, by definition of m, we have that there exists $\alpha_m \in \pi R$ such that

$$\alpha_m H(T) \equiv \pi^{m-\gamma_1} H'(T) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}.$$

Therefore

$$\pi^{m'-m}\alpha_m H(T) \equiv \pi^{m'-\gamma_1} H'(T) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}.$$

But we know that

$$\alpha_{m'} H(T) \equiv \pi^{m'-\gamma_1} H'(T) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}.$$

And, as seen in 6.1.4, the solution of the above equation is unique $\mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$. Therefore, $\pi^{m'-m}\alpha_m \equiv \alpha_{m'} \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$. So, by 2.2.13, there exists a model map

$$\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{m'},\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_{m'}S),1)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\kappa},\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_{m}S),1)}.$$

We recall that for any $m \geq \kappa$ the action of $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{m'},\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_{m'}S),1)}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
T_1 \longmapsto & \pi^{m-\gamma_1}S_1 + T_1 + \pi^m S_1 T_1 \\
T_2 \longmapsto & \frac{F(S_1)H(T_1) - H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S_1 + T_1 + \pi^m S_1 T_1)}{\pi^{\gamma_2} H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S_1 + T_1 + \pi^m S_1 T_1)} + \\
& + T_2 \frac{F(S_1)H(T_1)}{H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S_1 + T_1 + \pi^m S_1 T_1)} + S_2 \frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_2}T_2)H(T_1)}{H(\pi^{m-\gamma_1}S_1 + T_1 + \pi^m S_1 T_1)}
\end{aligned}$$

The above model map is compatible with the actions on Y. In particular, we have, for any $v(\lambda_{(1)}) \geq m > \kappa$, a model map

$$\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{m},\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_{m}S),1)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\kappa},\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_{\kappa}S),1)}.$$

compatible with the actions. Since the above model map is not an isomorphism, there is a nontrivial kernel $\tilde{H}$ of the morphism restricted to the special fiber. Since the map is compatible with the actions, then $\tilde{H} \subseteq (\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{m},\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_{m}S),1)})_k$ acts trivially on Y_k. So

$$\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{m},\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_{m}S),1)}$$

is not the effective model of the $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-action if $m > \kappa$. Hence, if an effective model exists, it must be $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\kappa},\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_{\kappa}S),1)}$. Since the group $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\kappa},\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_{\kappa}S),1)}$ exists, it follows, by 2.2.11, that $\kappa \geq \gamma_2$ and $\alpha_\kappa \in \Phi^1_{\pi^\kappa,\pi^{\gamma_2}}$. □

We remark that if X was of finite type over R then Y would be of finite type over R. So applying the theorem of existence of effective models 1.0.9 we would have finished. We now prove that $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\kappa},\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_{\kappa}S),1)}$ is the effective model for the action of $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$ in the general case. By construction the action is faithful on the generic fiber. Since X is essentially semireflexive over R it is sufficient, by 1.0.17, to check the faithfulness on the special fiber. Let us suppose that the map

$$\mathcal{G}_k = (\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\kappa},\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_{\kappa}S),1)})_k \longrightarrow Aut_k(Y_k)$$

has nontrivial kernel $\tilde{K}$. Since the action of $(G_{\pi^{\gamma_2},1})_k$ on Y_k is faithful by definition of γ_2, then $\tilde{K} \times_{\mathcal{G}_k} (G_{\pi^{\gamma_2},1})_k$ is the trivial group scheme. Therefore, $\tilde{K}$ is a group scheme of order p and

$$(\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\kappa},\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_{\kappa}S),1)})_k \simeq (G_{\pi^{\gamma_2},1})_k \times_k \tilde{K}$$

We distinguish two cases.

$\boxed{\kappa = \gamma_1.}$ Since $Y \longrightarrow Y_1$ is a $G_{\pi^{\gamma_2},1}$-torsor and $\tilde{K}$ acts trivially on Y_k, we have

$$(Y_1)_k \simeq Y_k/(G_{\pi^{\gamma_2},1})_k \simeq Y_k/((G_{\pi^{\gamma_2},1})_k \times_k \tilde{K}) \simeq Y_k/(\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\kappa},\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_{\kappa}S),1)})_k. \tag{29}$$

But by definition of γ_1, $Y_1 \longrightarrow X$ is a $G_{\pi^{\gamma_1},1}$-torsor. So, using the fact that $\kappa = \gamma_1$,

$$X_k \simeq (Y_1)_k/(G_{\pi^{\gamma_1},1})_k \simeq \Big(Y_k/(G_{\pi^{\gamma_2},1})_k\Big)\Big/\Big((\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\kappa},\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_{\kappa}S),1)})_k/(G_{\pi^{\gamma_2},1})_k\Big) \simeq Y_k/(\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\kappa},\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(\alpha_{\kappa}S),1)})_k,$$

which contradicts (29), since $X_k \neq (Y_1)_k$.

$\boxed{\kappa > \gamma_1.}$ We remark that necessarily $\gamma_2 > 0$. Indeed, if $\gamma_2 = 0$, then by 6.1.1(ii) and 6.1.7 necessarily $\kappa = \gamma_1$. It is also clear that $\kappa > 0$. Now, from 6.2.4(2) and (22), it follows that the action on the special fiber is given by the reduction $\mod \pi$ of

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &\longmapsto T_1 \\ T_2 &\longmapsto \frac{\alpha_\kappa H(T_1) - \pi^{\kappa-\gamma_1} H'(T_1)}{\pi^{\gamma_2} H(T_1)} S_1 + T_2 + S_2 \end{aligned}$$

We now prove that

$$\frac{\alpha_\kappa H(T_1) - \pi^{\kappa-\gamma_1} H'(T_1)}{\pi^{\gamma_2} H(T_1)} S_1 \not\equiv b S_1 \mod \pi \tag{30}$$

for any $b \in R$. Let us suppose $\frac{\alpha_\kappa H(T_1) - \pi^{\kappa-\gamma_1} H'(T_1)}{\pi^{\gamma_2} H(T_1)} S_1 \equiv b S_1 \mod \pi$ with $b \in R$. Then

$$\frac{\alpha_\kappa H(T_1) - \pi^{\kappa-\gamma_1} H'(T_1)}{\pi^{\gamma_2}} S_1 \equiv b H(T_1) S_1 \mod \pi$$

with $b \in R$. Therefore,

$$\frac{(\alpha_\kappa - b\pi^{\gamma_2}) H(T_1) - \pi^{\kappa-\gamma_1} H'(T_1)}{\pi^{\gamma_2}} \equiv 0 \mod \pi.$$

It clearly follows that

$$\frac{\alpha_\kappa - b\pi^{\gamma_2}}{\pi} H(T_1) \equiv \pi^{\kappa-1-\gamma_1} H'(T_1) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$$

Then $\alpha_{\kappa-1} = \frac{\alpha_\kappa - b\pi^{\gamma_2}}{\pi}$ satisfies $(\triangle)_{\kappa-1}$; it is easy to see that this implies $\alpha_{\kappa-1} \in \pi R$. The minimality of κ is contradicted. So we have proved (30).

We now consider three different cases. If $\gamma_2, \kappa < v(\lambda_{(1)})$, then

$$(\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^\kappa, \pi^{\gamma_2}; E_p(\alpha_\kappa S), 1)})_k \simeq \alpha_p \times_k \alpha_p = \operatorname{Spec}(k[S_1, S_2]/(S_1^p, S_2^p)).$$

Its subgroups of order p different from $(G_{\pi^{\gamma_2},1})_k$ are the subgroups $S_2 + bS_1 = 0$ with $b \in k$. If $\gamma_2 < \kappa = v(\lambda_{(1)})$, then

$$(\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^\kappa, \pi^{\gamma_2}; E_p(\alpha_\kappa S), 1)})_k \simeq \alpha_p \times_k \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} = \operatorname{Spec}(k[S_1, S_2]/(S_1^p - S_1, S_2^p))$$

and the only subgroup isomorphic to $\tilde{K} \simeq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is $S_2 = 0$. Finally, if $\gamma_2 = \kappa = v(\lambda_{(1)})$, then

$$(\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^\kappa, \pi^{\gamma_2}; E_p(\alpha_\kappa S), 1)})_k \simeq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \times_k \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} = \operatorname{Spec}(k[S_1, S_2]/(S_1^p - S_1, S_2^p - S_2))$$

and the only subgroups isomorphic to $\tilde{K} \simeq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ different from $(G_{\pi^{\gamma_2},1})_k$ are the subgroups $S_2 + bS_1 = 0$ with $b \in \mathbb{F}_p$. In any case, by (30), the action restricted to any subgroup of $(\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^\kappa, \pi^{\gamma_2}; E_p(\alpha_\kappa S), 1)})_k$ is not trivial.

We now prove the last sentence of the theorem. We have, by definition,

$$\alpha_\kappa H(T_1) \equiv \pi^{\kappa-\gamma_1} H'(T_1) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2} \tag{31}$$

Moreover, $H(T_1) \in B_1^*$ and, if we consider $H'(T_1) \in B_{1(\pi)}$, we have

$$v(H'(T_1)) = j, \tag{32}$$

by 6.1.2. If $\alpha_\kappa \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$, then by (31) and (32), it follows that $\pi^{\kappa-\gamma_1+j} \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$. Therefore, $\kappa - \gamma_1 + j \geq \gamma_2$. So, by 6.1.7, we have $\kappa - \gamma_1 + j = \gamma_2$. While, if $\alpha_\kappa \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$, it follows again from (31) and (32) that $v(\alpha_k) = \kappa - \gamma_1 + j$. The theorem is proved. □

We here give a criterion to determine when Y has a structure of torsor.

Corollary 6.2.7. *Let us suppose we are in the hypothesis of the theorem. Then* $Y \longrightarrow X$ *is a* G*-torsor under some finite and flat group scheme* G *if and only if* $\kappa = \gamma_1$*. Moreover,* $\kappa = \gamma_1$ *if and only if* $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2$ *and* $H(T) \equiv E_p(aT) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$*, for some* $a \in \pi R$ *such that* $a^p \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$*. In such a case,* $G = \mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\gamma_1}, \pi^{\gamma_2}; H, 1)}$*.*

Remark 6.2.8. The degeneration type of any $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\gamma_1}, \pi^{\gamma_2}; E_p(\alpha_\kappa S), 1)}$-torsor is

$$(v(\alpha_\kappa), \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_1),$$

if $\alpha_\kappa \not\equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$ and

$$(\gamma_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_1)$$

otherwise. This follows from 6.2.1 and 6.2.7.

Proof. We remarked in 1.0.7 that if $Y \longrightarrow X$ is a G-torsor for some finite and flat group scheme then G must coincide with the effective model $\mathcal{G}$ of $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$ acting on Y. In other words, $Y \longrightarrow X$ is a G-torsor if and only if it is a $\mathcal{G}$-torsor. By the theorem we have that the effective model for the $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-action is $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\kappa}, \pi^{\gamma_2}; E_p(\alpha_\kappa S), 1)}$. Moreover, there is the following exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow G_{\pi^{\gamma_2},1} \xrightarrow{i} \mathcal{G} \xrightarrow{p} G_{\pi^{\kappa},1} \longrightarrow 0$$

By 1.0.8 (i), we have that $G_{\pi^{\gamma_2},1}$ is the effective model of the action of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$ on Y. Now if $Y \longrightarrow X$ is a $\mathcal{G}$-torsor, then it satisfies the hypothesis of 1.0.8 (iii), then $G_{\pi^{\kappa},1}$ is the effective model of the action of $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ on Y_1. But by the definition of γ_1, we have that $Y_1 \longrightarrow X$ is a $G_{\pi^{\gamma_1},1}$-torsor. Then, again by 1.0.7, we have $G_{\pi^{\kappa},1} \simeq G_{\pi^{\gamma_1},1}$, which implies $\kappa = \gamma_1$.

Let us now suppose that $\kappa = \gamma_1$. We recall that

$$Y = \operatorname{Spec}(A[T_1, T_2]/(\frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1)^p - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_1}} - f_1, \frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_2}T_2)^p - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_2}} - \frac{gH(T_1)^{-p}(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1) - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_2}}))$$

Moreover, by definition of κ, we have $\alpha_\kappa H(T) \equiv H'(T) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$. Then, by 6.2.5, it follows that $H(T) \equiv E_p(\alpha_\kappa T) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$. Now let us substitute $T_2 H(T_1)^{-1}$ to T_2. Then we obtain

$$Y = \operatorname{Spec}(A[T_1, T_2]/(\frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1)^p - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_1}} - f_1, \frac{(H(T_1)+\pi^{\gamma_2}T_2)^p(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1)^{-1} - g}{\pi^{p\gamma_2}}))$$

By definition of $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\gamma_1}, \pi^{\gamma_2}; E_p(\alpha_\kappa S), 1)}$ there exists $G \in \operatorname{Hom}_{gr}(\mathcal{G}^{(\pi^{\gamma_1})}{}_{|S_{\pi^{p\gamma_2}}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_{\pi^{p\gamma_2}}})$ such that

$$E_p(\alpha_\kappa S)^p(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}S)^{-1} = G(\frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}S)^p - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_1}}) \in \operatorname{Hom}_{gr}(\mathcal{G}^{(\pi^{\gamma_1})}{}_{|S_{\pi^{p\gamma_2}}}, \mathbb{G}_{m|S_{\pi^{p\gamma_2}}}).$$

We remark that, if we think $E_p(\alpha_\kappa T_1), G(T_1) \in B_1^*$, the previous equation gives

$$E_p(\alpha_\kappa T_1)^p(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1)^{-1} \equiv G(f_1) \mod \pi^{p\gamma_2}B_1.$$

However, we have that $H(T_1)^p(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1)^{-1} \equiv E_p(\alpha_\kappa T_1)^p(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1)^{-1} \equiv g \mod \pi^{p\gamma_2}B_1$. Therefore, using 4.1.4,

$$g \equiv G(f_1) \mod \pi^{p\gamma_2}A$$

i.e. $g = G(f_1) + \pi^{p\gamma_2}f_2$ for some $f_2 \in A$. Hence, by §2.3, $Y \longrightarrow X$ is a $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\gamma_1}, \pi^{\gamma_2}; E_p(\alpha_\kappa S), 1)}$-torsor.

We now have, by definition of κ, that $\kappa = \gamma_1$ if and only if there exists $\alpha_\kappa \in \pi R$ such that

$$\alpha_\kappa H(T_1) \equiv H'(T_1) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2} \tag{33}$$

We remark that, since $\kappa \geq \gamma_2$, $\kappa = \gamma_1$ only if $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2$. In such a case, by 6.2.5, $H(T_1)$ satisfies (33) if and only if there exist $\alpha_\kappa \in \pi R$ such that $\alpha_\kappa^p \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$ and $H(T_1) \equiv E_p(\alpha_\kappa T_1) \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$.
□

In particular we obtain the following result.

Corollary 6.2.9. *If* $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2$ *(or equivalently* $v(\mathcal{D}(h_1)) > v(\mathcal{D}(h_2))$*), then* $Y \longrightarrow X$ *has no structure of torsor.*

Remark 6.2.10. Unfortunately we have no example of coverings with $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2$. So we don't know if this case can really occur.

Example 6.2.11. We here give an example, for any $p \geq 3$, where $Y \longrightarrow X$ is not a $\mathcal{G}$-torsor under any group scheme $\mathcal{G}$. Notation is as above. We moreover suppose that there exists $f_1 \in A_k^* \setminus A_k^{*p}$ such that $A_k \setminus A_k^p[f_1] \neq \emptyset$. Take γ_1, γ_2 such that $v(p) > p\gamma_1 > p^2\gamma_2 > 0$. In particular we have $v(p) > (p-1)\gamma_1 + p\gamma_2$. Let us take liftings in A of $f_1 \in A_k^* \setminus A_k^{*p}$ and $f_2 \in A_k \setminus A_k^p[f_1]$ which we will again denote by f_1 and f_2. Moreover, let us consider $g = f_1 + \pi^{p\gamma_2} f_2 \in A^*$. We consider the $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsor $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ with

$$Y_K \simeq \operatorname{Spec}(A_K[T]/(T^{p^2} - (1+\pi^{p\gamma_1} f_1)g^p)).$$

For instance, we can take $A = R[Z]_{(\pi, Z)}$, $\gamma_1 = p+1$, $\gamma_2 = 1$, $f_1 = 1+Z^2$, $f_2 = Z$, $g = 1 + Z^2 + \pi^p Z$.

Then we consider $\operatorname{Spec}(B_1) = \operatorname{Spec}(A[T_1]/(\frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1)^p - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_1}} - f_1))$. Since f_1 is not a p-th power mod π then $\operatorname{Spec}(B_1)_k$ is integral and $\operatorname{Spec}(B_1)$ is normal (see 4.1.5). So $Y_1 = \operatorname{Spec}(B_1)$. We remark that by hypothesis we have that $T_1^p \equiv f_1 \mod \pi^{p\gamma_2+1}$. We now take $H(T_1) = T_1 \in B_1^*$. Then we have, by construction,

$$\frac{g(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1) - H(T_1)^p}{\pi^{p\gamma_2}} \equiv f_2 \mod \pi.$$

So we consider

$$\operatorname{Spec}(B_1[T_2]/(\frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_2}T_2)^p - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_2}} - \frac{H(T_1)^{-p} g(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1) - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_2}}))$$

Hence

$$\operatorname{Spec}(B_k) = \operatorname{Spec}(A[T_1, T_2]/(T_1^p - f_1, T_2^p - \frac{f_2}{f_1}))$$

Since $(B_1)_k^p = A_k^p[f_1]$ and $f_2 \notin A_k^p[f_1]$, then $\operatorname{Spec}(B_k)$ is integral, therefore $\operatorname{Spec}(B)$ is normal. Hence, $Y = \operatorname{Spec}(B)$. The degeneration type of $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ is $(0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_1+\gamma_2)$. Indeed $H'(T_1) = 1$, so

$$aT_1 \equiv \pi^{\kappa - \gamma_1} \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$$

if and only if $a \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}$ and $\kappa - \gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2$. Since $\kappa \leq \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - j$ this means $\kappa = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2$ and $j = 0$. The effective model is

$$\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\gamma_1+\gamma_2}, \pi^{\gamma_2}; 1, 1)}.$$

Since $\kappa = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 > \gamma_1$ then Y is not a $\mathcal{G}$-torsor by 6.2.7.

7. Realization of degeneration types

We have shown in the above section that the degeneration type has to satisfy some restrictions. We here want to study the problem of determining the elements of $\mathbb{N}^4$ which can be degeneration type of some cover $Y \longrightarrow X$. The notation and the hypothesis are the same as in the previous section.

Definition 7.0.1. Any 4-uple $(j, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \kappa) \in \mathbb{N}^4$ with the following properties:

- i) $\max\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\} \leq \kappa \leq v(\lambda_{(1)})$;
- ii) $\gamma_2 \leq p(\kappa - \gamma_1 + j) \leq p\gamma_2$;
- iii) if $\kappa < p\gamma_2$ then $\gamma_1 - j = v(\lambda_{(1)}) - v(\lambda_{(2)}) = \frac{v(p)}{p}$; if $\kappa \geq p\gamma_2$ then $0 \leq p(\gamma_2 - j) \leq v(p) - p\gamma_1 + \kappa$;
- iv) $pj \leq \gamma_1$;

will be called an *admissible degeneration type.*

Remark 7.0.2. We remark that if $\kappa < p\gamma_2$, then j is uniquely determined from γ_1 and moreover i) and iii) imply iv). The first assertion follows from iii). For the second, we note that, if $\kappa < p\gamma_2$, multiplying iii) by p, we have $p\gamma_1 - pj = (p-1)v(\lambda_{(1)})$, since $pv(\lambda_{(2)}) = v(\lambda_{(1)})$. Therefore, by i), we have

$$\gamma_1 - pj = (p-1)(v(\lambda_{(1)}) - \gamma_1) \geq 0.$$

Moreover, we remark that we always have

$$0 \leq \kappa - \gamma_1 + j \leq \min\{\gamma_2, v(\lambda_{(2)})\}.$$

By ii) we have to prove only $\kappa - \gamma_1 + j \leq v(\lambda_{(2)})$. Moreover, since $v(\lambda_{(1)}) \geq \kappa \geq p\gamma_2$ implies $\gamma_2 \leq v(\lambda_{(2)})$, we have to consider only the case $\kappa < p\gamma_2$. But by iii) and i), it follows that

$$\kappa - \gamma_1 + j = \kappa - \frac{v(p)}{p} \leq v(\lambda_{(1)}) - v(\lambda_{(1)}) + v(\lambda_{(2)}) = v(\lambda_{(2)}).$$

Lemma 7.0.3. *Any degeneration type* $(j, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \kappa)$ *attached to a* $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$*-torsor* $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ *is admissible.*

Proof. i) comes from definitions and 6.2.6, while iv) has been proved in 6.1.1(i). We now prove ii). By 6.2.1, it follows that the effective model of the action of $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$ on Y is $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\kappa}, \pi^{\gamma_1}; E_p(\alpha_\kappa), 1)}$ with $v(\alpha_\kappa) = \kappa - \gamma_1 + j$, if $\alpha_\kappa \neq 0$; and $\kappa - \gamma_1 + j = \gamma_2$ if $\alpha_\kappa = 0$. Since, by 6.2.6, $\alpha_\kappa \in \Phi^1_{\pi^\kappa, \pi^{\gamma_2}}$, then

$$\alpha_\kappa^p \equiv 0 \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}. \tag{34}$$

Hence, we have

$$\gamma_2 \leq p(\kappa - \gamma_1 + j).$$

From 6.1.7, it follows that $\kappa - \gamma_1 + j \leq \gamma_2$. This proves ii).

Let us now suppose $\kappa < p\gamma_2$. Since $\alpha_\kappa \in \Phi^1_{\pi^\kappa, \pi^{\gamma_2}}$, by 2.2.11 and 2.2.12, we have that

$$\kappa - \gamma_1 + j = \kappa - \frac{v(p)}{p},$$

which implies $\gamma_1 - j = \frac{v(p)}{p}$. While, if $\kappa \geq p\gamma_2$, by 2.2.11, we have that

$$pv(\alpha_\kappa) = p(\kappa - \gamma_1 + j) \geq p\gamma_2 + (p-1)\kappa - v(p)$$

which gives

$$p(\gamma_2 - j) \leq v(p) - p\gamma_1 + \kappa.$$

We remark that $\gamma_2 - j \geq 0$ comes from 6.1.1(ii). Hence iii) is proved. □

Definition 7.0.4. Any admissible degeneration type, which is the degeneration type attached to a $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsor $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$, such that the normalization Y of X in Y_K has integral special fiber, will be called *realizable.*

We now see, as a consequence of theorem 6.2.1, what happens in some particular cases.

Proposition 7.0.5. *Let us suppose* $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ *has* $(j, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \kappa)$ *as degeneration type.*

i) *If* $j < v(\lambda_{(2)})$ *then* $pj = \gamma_1$ *if and only if* Y *is a* $G_{\pi^j,2}$*-torsor. Moreover, the degeneration type is* (j, pj, j, pj)*. In particular* Y *is a* μ_{p^2}*-torsor if and only if* $\gamma_1 = 0$*, i.e.* $v(\mathcal{D}(h_1)) = v(p)$*.*

ii) $j = v(\lambda_{(2)})$ *if and only if* Y *is an* $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)})}, \pi^{\gamma_2}; E_p(\eta_\pi S), 1)}$*-torsor. Necessarily* $\gamma_2 \geq v(\lambda_{(2)})$ *and the degeneration type is* $(v(\lambda_{(2)}), v(\lambda_{(1)}), \gamma_2, v(\lambda_{(1)}))$*.*

iii) $\gamma_2 = j$ *if and only if* Y *is a* $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\gamma_1}, \pi^{\gamma_2}; 1, 1)}$*-torsor. Necessarily* $\gamma_1 \geq p\gamma_2$ *and the degeneration type is* $(\gamma_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_1)$*. In particular* Y *is a* $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\gamma_1}, 1; 1, 1)}$*-torsor if and only if* $\gamma_2 = 0$*, i.e.* $v(\mathcal{D}(h_2)) = v(p)$*.*

iv) *Let* $j = 0$*. Then* $Y_K \longrightarrow X_K$ *is strongly extendible if and only if* $\gamma_2 = 0$*.*

v) Y *is a* $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$*-torsor if and only if* $\gamma_2 = v(\lambda_{(1)})$*, i.e.* $v(\mathcal{D}(h_2)) = 0$*. And the degeneration type is* $(v(\lambda_{(2)}), v(\lambda_{(1)}), v(\lambda_{(1)}), v(\lambda_{(1)}))$*.*

vi) *If* $\gamma_1 = v(\lambda_{(1)})$*, i.e.* $v(\mathcal{D}(h_1)) = 0$*, then* $j = \min\{\gamma_2, v(\lambda_{(2)})\}$*. So we are in the case (ii) or (iii).*

Remark 7.0.6. The example 6.2.11 is in the case *iv*).

Proof. By the previous lemma $(j, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \kappa)$ is an admissible degeneration type.

i) Let us suppose $\gamma_1 = pj$. If $\kappa < p\gamma_2$, then by 7.0.1(iii) it follows that

$$(p-1)j = \gamma_1 - j = \frac{v(p)}{p} = (p-1)v(\lambda_{(2)}),$$

but this is in contradiction with $j < v(\lambda_{(2)})$. Hence $\kappa \geq p\gamma_2$. Therefore, by 7.0.1(ii),

$$(p-1)\gamma_2 \leq \kappa - \gamma_2 \leq \gamma_1 - j = (p-1)j.$$

But, by 7.0.1(iii), $\gamma_2 \geq j$. Hence, $\gamma_2 = j$. So, by 6.1.7, $\kappa = \gamma_1$. Then, by 6.2.7, we have that Y is a $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^j, \pi^{pj}; 1, 1)}$-torsor. But, as we have seen in the example 2.2.7,

$$\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^j, \pi^{pj}; 1, 1)} \simeq G_{\pi^j, 2}$$

Conversely, as remarked in 6.2.8 (j, pj, j, pj) is the degeneration type of a $G_{\pi^j,2}$-torsor.

We now observe that, in particular, Y is a μ_{p^2}-torsor if and only if $\gamma_1 = pj = 0$. But, since $pj \leq \gamma_1$ (see 7.0.1(iv)), then it is true if and only if $\gamma_1 = 0$, as stated.

ii) Let us suppose $j = v(\lambda_{(2)})$. By 7.0.1(i),(iv) we have $\gamma_1 = pj = v(\lambda_{(1)})$ and $\kappa = v(\lambda_{(1)})$. Therefore, by 6.2.1, we have that $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)})}, \pi^{\gamma_2}; E_p(\alpha_\kappa S), 1)}$ is the effective model. In particular, there is a model map

$$\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z} \simeq \mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)})}, \pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)})}; E_p(\eta_\pi S), 1)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)})}, \pi^{\gamma_2}; E_p(\alpha_\kappa S), 1)}.$$

Hence, by 2.2.13, it follows that

$$\alpha_\kappa \equiv \eta_\pi \mod \pi^{\gamma_2}.$$

So, by 6.2.7, Y is a $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)})}, \pi^{\gamma_2}; E_p(\eta_\pi S), 1)}$-torsor. Conversely, if Y is a $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{v(\lambda_{(1)})}, \pi^{\gamma_2}; E_p(\eta_\pi S), 1)}$-torsor then, by 6.2.8, the degeneration type is

$$(v(\eta_\pi), v(\lambda_{(1)}), \gamma_2, v(\lambda_{(1)})).$$

So $j = v(\eta_\pi) = v(\lambda_{(2)})$. We observe that $j = v(\lambda_{(2)}) \leq \gamma_2$ by 6.1.1(ii).

iii) From 6.2.7 and 6.2.8, it follows that Y is a $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\gamma_1}, \pi^{\gamma_2}; 1, 1)}$-torsor if and only if $\kappa = \gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2 = j$. But, by 6.1.7, $\gamma_2 = j$ implies $\kappa = \gamma_1$. The thesis follows. From 2.2.7, it follows that $\gamma_1 \geq p\gamma_2$. And by 6.2.8 we have that the degeneration type is $(\gamma_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_1)$. Now if $\gamma_2 = 0$ then, by 6.1.1, $j = 0$ and we have the last sentence.

iv) If $j = 0$, then from 7.0.1(ii) we have

$$\gamma_2 \leq p(\kappa - \gamma_1) \leq p\gamma_2.$$

The thesis easily follows from 6.2.7.

v) By 6.2.8, it follows that a $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsor $Y \longrightarrow X$ has

$$(v(\lambda_{(2)}), v(\lambda_{(1)}), v(\lambda_{(1)}), v(\lambda_{(1)}))$$

as degeneration type. Now let us suppose $\gamma_2 = v(\lambda_{(1)})$. Since, by 7.0.1($i$), $v(\lambda_{(1)}) \geq \kappa \geq \gamma_2$ then $\kappa = v(\lambda_{(1)})$. Therefore, the effective model for Y is $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$, since it is a model of $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$ which is an extension of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ by $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ (see 2.2.13). Let σ be a generator of $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$. Since $\gamma_2 = v(\lambda_{(1)})$, then, by 5.0.1, $Y \longrightarrow Y_1$ is a $< \sigma^p >$-torsor. In particular, $< \sigma^p >$ has no inertia at the generic point of the special fiber. This implies that $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z} =< \sigma >$ has no inertia at the generic point of the special fiber. Let us now consider the action of $< \sigma > / < \sigma^p >$ on $Y_1 = Y/ < \sigma^p >$. If $\sigma_{|(Y_1)_k} = \mathrm{id}$ then we will have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
Y_k \arrow[rr, "\sigma"] \arrow[dr] & & Y_k \arrow[dl] \\
& (Y_k)/ < \sigma^p > &
\end{tikzcd}$$

This is a contradiction, since $\sigma_{|Y_k} \neq \mathrm{id}$. So $< \sigma > / < \sigma^p >$ has no inertia at the generic fiber, therefore $Y_1 \longrightarrow X$ is a $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$-torsor, by 5.0.1. Hence $\gamma_1 = \kappa = \lambda_{(1)}$, which implies, by 6.2.7, that $Y \longrightarrow X$ is a $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsor.

vi) Since, by 7.0.1(i), $v(\lambda_{(1)}) \geq \kappa \geq \gamma_1$, if $\gamma_1 = v(\lambda_{(1)})$ then $\kappa = \gamma_1$. So by 7.0.1(iii)

$$j = v(\lambda_{(2)})$$

if $\gamma_1 < p\gamma_2$ (i.e. $\gamma_2 > v(\lambda_{(2)})$), and

$$j = \gamma_2$$

if $\gamma_1 \geq p\gamma_2$ (i.e. $\gamma_2 \leq v(\lambda_{(2)})$).

□

Remark 7.0.7. Let us suppose that $p|v(p)$. Then, for instance,

$$(j, \frac{v(p)}{p} + j, v(\lambda_{(1)}), v(\lambda_{(1)}))$$

is admissible for $0 \leq j \leq v(\lambda_{(2)})$, but is not realizable, if $j \neq v(\lambda_{(2)})$, by the point (v) of the proposition.

So we have seen that, in general, not all the degeneration types are realizable. But we now see that it is true for admissible degeneration types with $\kappa = \gamma_1 < v(\lambda_{(1)})$. They are degeneration types attached to $(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})_K$-torsors which are strongly extendible.

Theorem 7.0.8. *Let us suppose that R contains a primitive p^2-th root of unity and that $p > 2$. Let $X := \operatorname{Spec} A$ be a normal essentially semireflexive scheme over R with integral fibers such that $\pi \in \mathcal{R}_A$. We assume ${}_{p^2}Pic(X_K) = 0$, $H^1(X_k, \mu_p) \neq 0$ and that there exists $f \in A_k \setminus {A_k}^p$ such that $A_k^* \not\subseteq A_k^p[f]$. Then any admissible degeneration type $(j, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \kappa)$ with $\kappa = \gamma_1 < v(\lambda_{(1)})$ is realizable.*

Remark 7.0.9. The hypothesis $H^1(X_k, \mu_p) \neq 0$ is necessary; otherwise, for instance, it is not possible to construct μ_{p^2}-torsors with integral special fibers. Let us now consider a $\mathcal{E}^{(\gamma_1,1;1,1)}$-torsor with $v(\lambda_{(1)}) > \gamma_1 > 0$. From §2.3 it is of the form

$$Y = \operatorname{Spec}(A[T_1, T_2]/(\frac{(1 + \pi^{\gamma_1}T_1)^p - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_1}} - f_1, T_2^p(1 + \pi^{\gamma_1}T_1)^{-1} - f_2))$$

for some $f_1 \in A$ and $f_2 \in A^*$. We stress that for any $g \in A$ we will denote again by g its image in A_k. We remark that $Y_k = \operatorname{Spec}(A_k[T_1, T_2]/(T_1^p - f_1, T_2^p - f_2))$ is integral if and only if $f_1 \notin {A_k}^p$ and $f_2 \in A_k^*$ but $f_2 \notin A_k^p[f_1]$. So if the last condition would not be satisfied, there would not be $\mathcal{E}^{(\gamma_1,1;1,1)}$-torsors with integral special fiber. While the hypothesis $\gamma_1 < v(\lambda_{(1)})$ is technical and it should be removed adding appropriate hypothesis on X.

Proof. We recall that in this case to be an admissible degeneration type means

i) $\gamma_1 < v(\lambda_{(1)})$;
ii) $\gamma_2 \leq pj \leq p\gamma_2$;
iii) if $\gamma_1 < p\gamma_2$ then $\gamma_1 - j = v(\lambda_{(1)}) - v(\lambda_{(2)}) = \frac{v(p)}{p}$; if $\gamma_1 \geq p\gamma_2$ then $p(\gamma_2 - j) \leq (p-1)(v(\lambda_{(1)}) - \gamma_1)$;
iv) $pj \leq \gamma_1$;

We remark that (iv) is in fact implied by the others. Indeed, let us suppose that $pj > \gamma_1$. Then by (ii) we have $p\gamma_2 \geq pj > \gamma_1$. But we know, by 7.0.2 that if $p\gamma_2 > \gamma_1$ then $pj \leq \gamma_1$.

Since $\kappa = \gamma_1$, it follows, by 6.2.8, that if $(j, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \kappa)$ is realizable it is the degeneration type of a $\mathcal{E}^{(\gamma_1,\gamma_2;E_p(\alpha_{\gamma_1}S),1)}$-torsor, with $v(\alpha_{\gamma_1}) = j$ if $\alpha_{\gamma_1} \neq 0$ and $j = \gamma_2$ if $\alpha_{\gamma_1} = 0$. For any γ_1, γ_2 as in the degeneration type, by 2.2.11 there exists a group scheme $\mathcal{E}^{(\pi^{\gamma_1},\pi^{\gamma_2};E_p(aS),1)}$. If $a \neq 0$ then we can choose a such that $v(\tilde{a}) = j$, where $\tilde{a} \in R$ is a lifting of a. In fact, if $\gamma_1 < p\gamma_2$ it is automatic, by 2.2.12 and iii), that $v(\tilde{a}) = j$. We call $a = \alpha_{\gamma_1}$.

We now construct a normal $\mathcal{E}^{(\gamma_1,\gamma_2;E_p(\alpha_{\gamma_1}S),1)}$-torsor with integral special fiber. First of all, we remark that if $\gamma_1 = 0$ then $\gamma_2 = 0$ and $\mathcal{E}^{(\gamma_1,\gamma_2;E_p(\alpha_{\gamma_1}S),1)} \simeq \mu_{p^2}$. So if we take $Y = \mathrm{Spec}(A[T]/(T^{p^2} - f))$ with $f \in A^*$ not a p-th power $\mod \pi$, then Y_k is integral. Hence Y is normal by 4.1.5.

We now suppose $\gamma_1 > 0$. Let us take $f_1, f_2 \in A$. Since $\pi \in \mathcal{R}_A$, then $1 + \pi^{p\gamma_1} f_1 \in A^*$ and $E_p(\alpha^p_{\gamma_1} f_1) + \pi^{p\gamma_2} f_2 \in A^*$. Then we can define the $\mathcal{E}^{(\gamma_1,\gamma_2;E_p(\alpha_{\gamma_1}S),1)}$-torsor

$$Y = \mathrm{Spec}\left(A[T_1,T_2]/(\frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1)^p - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_1}} - f_1, \frac{(E_p(\alpha_{\gamma_1}T_1) + \pi^{\gamma_2}T_2)^p(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1)^{-1} - E_p(\alpha^p_{\gamma_1}f_1)}{\pi^{p\gamma_2}} - f_2)\right).$$

See §2.3 and 2.2.10. We have only to find f_1 and f_2 such that Y has integral special fiber. Take f_1 such that f_1 is not a p-th power $\mod \pi$ and $A^*_k \not\subseteq A^p_k[f_1]$. Then we have that the special fiber of

$$Y_1 = \mathrm{Spec}(B_1) = \mathrm{Spec}\left(A[T_1]/(\frac{(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1)^p - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_1}} - f_1)\right)$$

is integral. We now consider

$$Y = \mathrm{Spec}\left(B_1[T_2]/(\frac{(E_p(\alpha_{\gamma_1}T_1) + \pi^{\gamma_2}T_2)^p(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1)^{-1} - E_p(\alpha^p_{\gamma_1}f_1)}{\pi^{p\gamma_2}} - f_2)\right).$$

Since $\gamma_2 \leq \gamma_1$ then $\gamma_2 < v(\lambda_{(1)})$. The special fiber is

$$Y_k = \mathrm{Spec}\left((B_1)_k[T_2]/\big(T_2^p - \frac{E_p(\alpha_{\gamma_1}T_1)^{-p}(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1)E_p(\alpha^p_{\gamma_1}f_1) - 1}{\pi^{p\gamma_2}} - f_2)\right)$$

Let $P(T_1) := \frac{E_p(\alpha_{\gamma_1}T_1)^{-p}(1+\pi^{\gamma_1}T_1)E_p(\alpha^p_{\gamma_1}f_1)-1}{\pi^{p\gamma_2}}$. If $P(T_1) + f_2$ is not a p-th power $\mod \pi B_1$, then Y_k is reduced. While if $P(T_1) + f_2 \equiv P_1(T_1)^p \mod \pi$ for some $P_1(T_1) \in B_1^*$ then we substitute $f_2 + f_3$ to f_2 with f_3 not a p-th power $\mod \pi B_1$. The fact that f_3 is not a p-th power $\mod \pi B_1$ means, as one can easily check, that $f_3 \mod \pi$ does not belong to $A^p_k[f_1]$. Such f_3 there exists by hypothesis on f_1. Now, if

$$P(T_1) + f_2 + f_3 \equiv P_2(T_1)^p \mod \pi B_1$$

for some $P_2(T_1) \in B_1^*$, then

$$f_3 \equiv (P_2(T_1) - P_1(T_1))^p \mod \pi B_1.$$

Then it follows that f_3 is a p-power $\mod \pi B_1$, against hypothesis on f_3.

Finally, we verify that Y has $(j, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_1)$ as degeneration type. Since $\kappa = \gamma_1$, by 6.2.1, we have that the degeneration type is $(v(\alpha_{\gamma_1}), \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_1)$ if $\alpha_{\gamma_1} \neq 0$ and $(\gamma_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_1)$ if $\alpha_{\gamma_1} = 0$. But, since we have chosen α_{γ_1} such that $\alpha_{\gamma_1} = 0$ and $j = \gamma_2$ or $v(\alpha_{\gamma_1}) = j$ and $\alpha_{\gamma_1} \neq 0$, then we have the thesis.

□

References

[1] *Schémas en groupes. II: Groupes de type multiplicatif, et structure des schémas en groupes généraux*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 152, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1962/1964, Algebraic Geometry Seminar of Bois Marie 1962/64 (SGA 3). Directed by M. Demazure and A. Grothendieck..

[2] *Revêtements étales et groupe fondamental* , Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 224, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971, Algebraic Geometry Seminar of Bois Marie 1960/61 (SGA 1), Directed by A. Grothendieck.

[3] Abramovich, Dan and appendix by Lubin, Jonathan, "Raynaud's group-scheme and reduction of coverings", 2003, arXiv:math/0304352v2.

[4] Andreatta, Fabrizio and Gasbarri, Carlo, "Torsors under some group schemes of order p^n", *J. Algebra* **318** (2007), no. 2, p. 1057–1067.

[5] Antei, Marco, "Comparison between the fundamental group scheme of a relative scheme X and the one of its generic fibre", 2008, arXiv:math/0807.2286v1.

[6] Epp, Helmut P., "Eliminating wild ramification", *Inventiones Mathematicae* **19** (1973), p. 235–249".

[7] Gasbarri, Carlo, "Heights of vector bundles and the fundamental group scheme of a curve", *Duke Mathematical Journal* **117** (2003), no. 2, p. 287–311.

[8] Green, Barry and Matignon, Michel, "Liftings of Galois covers of smooth curves", *Compositio Math.* **113** (1998), no. 3, p. 237–272.

[9] Green, Barry and Matignon, Michel, "Order p automorphisms of the open disc of a p-adic field", *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* **12** (1999), no. 1, p. 269-303.

[10] Gruson, Laurent and Raynaud, Michel, "Critères de platitude et de projectivité. Techniques de “platification” d'un module", *Invent. Math.* **13** (1971), p. 1–89.

[11] Hartshorne, Robin, *Algebraic geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 52, Springer, New York-Heidelberg, 1977.

[12] Henrio,Yannick, "Arbres de Hurwitz et automorphismes d'ordre p des disques et des couronnes p-adiques formels", 2000, arXiv:math/0011098v1.

[13] Liu, Qing, *Algebraic geometry and arithmetic curves*, Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 6, Oxford University Press, 2002.

[14] Milne, James S., *Étale cohomology*, Princeton Mathematical Series, vol. 33, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1980.

[15] Raynaud, Michel, "Schémas en groupes de type $(p, \ldots, p)$", *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **102** (1974), p. 241–280.

[16] Raynaud, Michel, "Spécialisation des revêtements en caractéristique $p > 0$", *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)* **32** (1999), no. 1, p. 87–126.

[17] Roberts, Lawrence G., "The flat cohomology of group schemes of rank p", *American Journal of Mathematics* **95** (1973),no. 3, p. 688–702.

[18] Romagny, Matthieu, "Sur quelques aspects des champs de revêtements de courbes algébriques", Thèse, Institut Fourier, Univ. Grenoble 1, 2002.

[19] Romagny, Matthieu, "Effective model of a finite group action", 2006, arXiv:math/0601639v1.

[20] Saïdi, Mohamed, "Torsors under finite and flat group schemes of rank p with Galois action", *Math. Z.* **245** (2003), no. 4, p. 695–710.

[21] Saïdi, Mohamed, "On the existence of a torsor structure for Galois covers", 2004, arXiv:Math/0403389v1.

[22] Saïdi, Mohamed, "On the degeneration of étale $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$-torsors in equal characteristic $p > 0$", *Hiroshima Math. J.* **37** (2007), no. 2, p. 315–341.

[23] Sekiguchi, Tsutomu, "On the deformations of Witt groups to tori II", *J. Algebra* **138** (1991), p. 273–297.

[24] Sekiguchi, Tsutomu and Suwa, Noriyuki, "Some cases of extensions of group schemes over a discrete valuation ring. I", *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math.* **38** (1991), no. 1, p. 1–45.

[25] Sekiguchi, Tsutomu and Suwa, Noriyuki, "Théorie de Kummer-Artin-Schreier et applications", *J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux* **7** (1995), no. 1, p. 177–189.

[26] Sekiguchi, Tsutomu and Suwa, Noriyuki, "A note on extensions of algebraic and formal groups. IV. Kummer-Artin-Schreier-Witt theory of degree p^2", *Tohoku Math. J. (2)* **53** 2001, no. 2, p. 203–240.

[27] Tossici, Dajano, "Models of $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$ over a d.v.r. of unequal characteristic", 2008, arXiv:math/0803.3702v1.

[28] Waterhouse, William C. and Weisfeiler, Boris, One-dimensional affine group schemes, *J. Algebra* **66** (1980), no. 2, p. 550–568.

Dipartimento di Matematica, Università Roma Tre, Largo S. Leonardo Murialdo 1, 00146, Rome, Italy, E-mail: dajano@mat.uniroma3.it